Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity

GRANT MACASKILL

SUPPLEMENTS TO THE JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF JUDAISM [115]

BRILL

Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity

Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism

Text and Studies

Editor

John J. Collins

The Divinity School, Yale University

Associate Editor

Florentino García Martínez

Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

Advisory Board

J. DUHAIME – A. HILHORST – P.W. VAN DER HORST

A. KLOSTERGAARD PETERSEN – M.A. KNIBB – J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUTTEN

J. SIEVERS – G. STEMBERGER – E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR – J. TROMP

VOLUME 115

Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity

By
Grant Macaskill

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

ISSN: 1384–2161
ISBN: 978 90 04 15582 4

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints BRILL, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical,
photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV
provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center,
222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vii
Preface ix

Chapter One *Wisdom, Apocalyptic and Generic Compatibility* 1

Chapter Two *1 Enoch* 26

Chapter Three *4QInstruction* 72

Chapter Four *The Gospel of Matthew* 115

Chapter Five *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch* 196

Chapter Six *Conclusions* 229

Appendix *Previous Research on Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Gospel of Matthew* 241

Bibliography 259

Index of Texts 285
Index of Modern Authors 292

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by The Arts and Humanities Research Council. I am grateful to them for providing the financial assistance they did and for the constant helpfulness of their staff.

My thanks go to Professor Richard Bauckham for his wise supervision of my doctoral research. I am particularly grateful to him for continuing to show interest in my research during the long period of his illness. Thanks also go to Dr. Mark Elliot who supervised me during Professor Bauckham's absence and who proved to be both a wellspring of important information and a good friend. In addition to my official supervisors, I must thank Jim Davila, who took a great interest in my project and was enormously helpful throughout the process. He and Dr. Alasdair I. Wilson examined the final thesis and provided numerous suggestions as to how it could be improved: I am grateful to them both for their valuable insights.

I am grateful also to Professor Andrei Orlov for his interest in my work and for sharing with me photographs of the manuscripts of *2 Enoch.* He has devoted years of his life to the study of *2 Enoch* and I can only hope he does not mind too much when this particular "youth" has disagreed with some of his conclusions. Likewise, I have continually been amazed by the grace and kindness of Frank Andersen, who has shared much of the wisdom built up over his long years with me.

My colleagues at St Mary's College must also be thanked. Librarians Colin Bovaird and Linda Kinloch proved more helpful than they ever needed to be, as did Debbie Smith, Margot Clement and Susan Millar. Among those who were students at the same time as I was, Ian Werret deserves particular acknowledgement for constantly acting as a sounding-board for my research conclusions. Dr. Alex Panayotov has also been a great help to me as I have continued to develop my work on *2 Enoch.*

I am, of course, enormously grateful to John J. Collins for accepting this thesis for inclusion among the *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* and for suggesting a number of ways in which the thesis could be refined. I must also thank Florentino García Martínez, who forwarded my manuscript to John and suggested that it might find a natural home in the series.

Within the community of St. Andrews, Alasdair I. and Cathie Macleod have shown endless support and deserve also to be credited with helping me through the last few years. More widely, I would like to thank the various members of my family, scattered throughout the country, for continuing to encourage me and to take an interest in my work.

Finally, thanks go to my wife Jane, who has endured many a long night alone as I have been consumed by my research. She supported us financially during the three years of my doctoral research; more importantly, she has loved and supported me in that time. Thank you.

PREFACE

This book arose out my doctoral research on the Gospel of Matthew and I think some introductory comment is probably required as to why it now finds itself in a series devoted to the study of Judaism.

In 2001, as I began to work towards my research proposal, I was intrigued by the fact that while scholars had identified the importance of sapiential and apocalyptic elements within Matthew's Gospel, the question of their relationship to one another within Matthew's schema had been largely ignored. Were they distinct elements with distinct functions within the Matthean narrative? Had they been brought together by redactional chance? Were they, in the end, uncomfortable bedfellows? Or might they relate to one another in some more subtle sense? Might their mutual presence point to some kind of underlying idea in Matthew, betrayed by their presence but largely overlooked by scholarship?

As I began to explore the issue, it became clear that at least one constituency within New Testament scholarship, dealing not with Matthew but with underlying sources and traditions, had dealt with this question in an extremely simple, redactional fashion: sapiential and apocalyptic elements in Q and in historical Jesus traditions belong to different strata—they are not simply distinct, but are to some extent mutually corrosive, being founded upon radically different views of God and salvation. Inevitably, such an approach impinges upon Matthew research since, on one hand, the Gospel is generally seen as dependent upon Q and, on the other, it is one of the sources used in reconstructing the Historical Jesus.

At the same time, I was aware that scholars of Second Temple Judaism, drawing on the rich and diverse sources of the time, were approaching the question in a very different way. The assumption of the "generic incompatibility" of wisdom and apocalyptic had been reassessed in the light of the variegated material from Qumran and the pseudepigrapha, with the conclusion that since these elements often occur together they are clearly not incompatible on a generic level. Thus, the focus of the question had shifted to the specifics and subtleties of the relationship.

I was keen, therefore, to approach the question of the relationship of these two elements in Matthew's Gospel in a way that would draw upon the valuable insights of this second group of scholars. It was important,

though, not to repeat the error of much New Testament scholarship by simply trawling Jewish texts for "background." Instead—and taking my cue from an article by John J. Collins, discussed below in chapter 1—I decided to focus on a small number of texts, seeking to ascertain whether there might be underlying themes or concepts that would explain the mutual presence of sapiential and apocalyptic elements.

A number of inter-related themes began to emerge: there was an emphasis in each text on revealed wisdom; this, in turn, played a pivotal role in an eschatology which depicted the revealing of wisdom as an inaugural event. Finally, in a way that varied from text to text, there was a sense that the righteous were capable, as those to whom wisdom had been revealed, to return to a state of fidelity to the will of God as Creator.

This process of discovery had been driven by my interest in Matthew's Gospel, but the themes and concepts that were uncovered may well be of heuristic significance to the study of other Jewish and Christian texts. With the benefit of hindsight, then, it seems to me that my research finds a more wholesome realisation in this volume, within which the findings can be seen in their own terms: as manifestations of Jewish thought and as attestations of the influence of that thought on early Christianity. Nevertheless, the final form of this book reflects the fact that it has grown out of research into the Gospel of Matthew: the chapter dealing with the Gospel is considerably longer than the other chapters. This should be recognised by the reader to be a consequence of the evolutionary process behind this book rather than a value judgement on the relative importance of the Gospel.

CHAPTER ONE

WISDOM, APOCALYPTIC AND GENERIC COMPATIBILITY

The question of the relationship between "wisdom" and "apocalypse" holds perennial interest for scholars. Gerhard von Rad, of course, famously saw the latter as rising from the former[1] and while his thesis never found widespread acceptance, scholars have continued to be drawn to examine their relationship, encouraged by some tantalising sense of connection between the two categories of literature; a connection that is real but impossible to pin-down. With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the identification therein of variegated texts—texts that blend sapiential and apocalyptic elements—scholars have found fresh avenues for exploration, with the result that recent years have seen the production of a significant body of literature on the topic.

In such a climate, it can be surprising for those familiar with the currents of research into early Judaism to turn their attention to New Testament scholarship, where there is at least one constituency that, far from being fascinated with the inter-relatedness of wisdom and apocalyptic, assigns them to different redactional strata, regards them as mutually incompatible and employs them as key criteria in identifying earlier and later elements within the gospel sources. Such an approach is exemplified by John S. Kloppenborg, whose work is focused upon the hypothetical gospel source Q, and John Dominic Crossan, whose work is in the field of historical Jesus research.

An examination of the works of these two scholars, taken as representative of all those who follow this approach, will provide a useful starting point for the present study. Such an examination flags up some of the issues that are worth exploring and some of the assumptions that need to be challenged in the context of a discussion of the wisdom-apocalyptic relationship in ancient Judaism and early Christianity. Specifically, it draws our attention to the question of eschatology, and to the problem of whether the categories of "realised" and "future"

---

[1] Gerhard von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (2 vols.; 4th ed., Munich: Kaiser, 1965) 2:315–30.

eschatology are helpful to employ in scholarship, or whether they inevitably lead to the establishment of a false dichotomy. This will provide the necessary backdrop to my argument for the importance of "inaugurated" (or "inaugural") eschatology in the ancient Jewish and early Christian texts that I survey. It will also demonstrate why the relationship of eschatology to form and ethics needs to be examined in the way that I do throughout this book.

John S. Kloppenborg and The Formation of Q

The work of John S. Kloppenborg has been of huge significance to scholars researching the nature and extent of the hypothetical gospel source, Q. A substantial number of the scholars involved in the Society of Biblical Literature's *Q Seminar* follow Kloppenborg in his understanding of the development of gospel sources,[2] and his work undergirds the work of other scholars such as Burton L. Mack and John Dominic Crossan.

Kloppenborg's most significant work in this area is *The Formation of Q*,[3] in which he argues that Q was a written document, composed in Greek and displaying three clear redactional strata, the earliest of which may be classified according to form as *gnomologium.*

Following an introduction in which he surveys the more significant material written about Q, Kloppenborg argues first that Q was a written document, rather than a collection of orally transmitted sayings.[4] His argument here is based on the high fidelity of double tradition material, and draws upon the statistical analysis of the gospels carried out by Carlston and Norlin,[5] whose work indicated a higher level of fidelity between passages belonging to the double tradition than between those belonging to the triple tradition. Kloppenborg furthers his case

---

[2] This fact is attested by the fact that of the contributors to the symposium edited by Kloppenborg, *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995), comprising largely members of that seminar. Only Richard A. Horsley voices disagreement with Kloppenborg in his article (ch. 3, "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," esp. 39–40).

[3] John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

[4] Ibid., 41–51.

[5] Charles E. Carlston and Dennis Norlin, "Once More—Statistics and Q." *HTR 64* (1971): 59–78.

by rejecting the work of Gerhardsson and Riesenfeld,[6] both of whom argue for a high level of faithfulness in oral transmission, on the basis that there is no evidence that the rabbinic models that underlie their approach were ever used in early Christianity[7] and that an explanation for the high levels of similarity between texts must therefore be a result of a shared written source. Having argued for Q being a written document, Kloppenborg proceeds to argue that the language in which it was written was Greek,[8] a point that will be important to his final conclusions regarding the classification of the strata of Q. He concludes his study of the nature and shape of Q by seeking to establish the order and extent of this written, Greek document.[9]

The second major part of Kloppenborg's study is an examination of the structure and thematic unity of Q.[10] Here he argues for a high level of topical organisation and for clear thematic unity within subsets of the material. Regarding the work as a whole, he agrees with Jacobson[11] that there is a unity based on Deuteronomistic motifs, but argues that this is redactional:

> Hence, although he has not attempted to prove that deuteronomistic theology pervades the whole of Q, Jacobson successfully demonstrates that at one point in its literary evolution, Q was organized and redacted from a coherent theological perspective. This redaction lends to the collection an important unity.[12]

This discussion of redaction leads Kloppenborg to close this important section with an outlining of the redaction-analytical method that he will employ in the following chapters' examination of Q.[13]

---

[6] Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript* (Uppsala: Gleerup, 1961); H. Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1957).

[7] Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 44–46.

[8] Ibid., 51–64.

[9] Ibid., 64–87.

[10] Ibid., 89–95.

[11] Arland D. Jacobson, "The Literary Unity of Q," *JBL 101* (1982) 265–389.

[12] Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 93.

[13] Ibid., 95–101. Kloppenborg develops the methodologies of Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, (WMANT 33; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969); Arland D. Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology in Q," Ph.D diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1978. Drawing these works together, he provides 3 main analytical tools:

1. "The determination of the compositional principles which guide the juxtaposition of originally independent sayings and groups of sayings. Naturally this presupposes and builds upon the results from form-critical analysis." (98)
2. "Second, redactional or compositional activity may be seen in insertions and glosses." (99)

The third main part of Kloppenborg's argument examines the clusters of sayings that announce judgement.[14] He argues that these belong to the same redactional stratum on the basis of several common features. First, he argues that they share a *projected audience*:

> Although of course the *actual* audience of these Q speeches is the community itself, i.e., those already sympathetic to the preaching of the kingdom, the *projected audience* consists of the impenitent and the opponents of the community preaching… In their redactional arrangement these sayings articulate the conflict between the Q group and their Jewish contemporaries over the preaching of the kingdom.[15]

Second, Kloppenborg argues that the sayings share a *form*, that of the *chria* (or apophthegm), "short pithy sayings which are given a brief introduction or setting."[16]

He continues, however, that "in contrast to Mark, the Q chriae are not concerned with legal matters but criticize instead the response of 'this generation' to the preaching of the kingdom."[17]

Third, Kloppenborg argues that the sayings share the common motif of judgement.[18] Taken together, these three common features unite the five sayings clusters and, at least to Kloppenborg, suggest a single redactional stratum.

In the next stage of his argument, Kloppenborg examines the remaining sayings clusters in Q.[19] In contrast to the previous group of passages, which were prophetic in nature, he argues that "these sayings clusters or 'speeches' are controlled instead by sapiential themes and devices and, notwithstanding several important interpolations, are directed at the Q community in support of its radical mode of existence."[20]

Again, he sees this material as belonging to a single sapiential stratum, based on several common features. First, there is a common *implied audience*: "The speeches in the main are addressed not to outsiders and

---

3. "Finally… comparison of Q with other streams of tradition—principally Mark—is a means by which to corroborate the conclusions obtained from [the above]." (100)

[14] Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 102–170. The passages examined are, following the convention that numbers them according to their position in Luke, 3:7–9, 16–17; 7:1–10, 18–35; 11:14–52; 12:39–59; 17:23–37.

[15] Ibid., 167.

[16] Ibid., 168.

[17] Ibid., 169.

[18] Ibid., 169.

[19] 6:20b–49; 9:57–62; 10:2–16, 21–24; 11:2–4, 9–13; 12:2–12; 12:22–34; 13:24–30.

[20] Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 171.

opponents, but to members of the community. The tone is hortatory and instructional, not polemical or threatening."[21]

Second, as with the prophetic material, these speeches present common *forms*:

> A large number of the sayings can be classed as sapiential admonitions of the form second-person plural (or, less commonly, singular) imperative, with or without a motive clause. Some of these imperatives are introduced by the formula λέγω ὑμῖν, also a sapiential locution.[22]

Kloppenborg does note that these forms also occur in prophetic speech, but uses the fact that they are put to different use in those contexts—to undergird pronouncements of judgement, not ethical behaviour—as an escape route from the implication that this might have for his thesis.[23]

Third, several common motifs unify these passages. Kloppenborg highlights *poverty, renunciation of violence* and *confidence in God's providential protection* as key motifs, stressing that "throughout these portions of Q *discipleship* is conceived in the most radical social and personal terms."[24] He also stresses that this discipleship is positively understood in Q as *the imitation of God.*[25] Finally he notes that these passages employ the term *Gentile* pejoratively, in sharp contrast to the term's use in the prophetic passages, in which Gentile faith is called as witness against the faithlessness of Israel. In drawing this discussion of motifs to a conclusion, Kloppenborg makes the following statement:

> With some justification, this stratum of Q could be termed 'the radical wisdom of the kingdom of God.' The dawning kingdom motivates the radical ethic of Q, and in turn the community members, by their mode of symbolic action (voluntary poverty, non-violence, love of enemies, etc.), point to the presence of the reign of God among them.[26]

The eschatological nature of the language used by Kloppenborg should not be ignored. He uses such language again in his final conclusion where he more explicitly describes Q as containing a realised eschatology.[27]

---

[21] Ibid., 238.
[22] Ibid., 239. Here Kloppenborg also very helpfully lists the range of wisdom forms occurring in the motive clauses.
[23] Ibid., 239.
[24] Ibid., 241.
[25] Ibid., 241.
[26] Ibid., 242.
[27] Ibid., 320–321.

Before leaving this discussion of the sapiential material in Q, Kloppenborg argues for this stratum being the formative one. His conclusions draw together some of the results of form-critical analysis made throughout the course of this chapter: "As the analysis has shown, sayings which contain the deuteronomistic and judgement motifs appear to have been interpolated into and around the wisdom speeches."[28]

Following the next section, in which Kloppenborg analyses the temptation narrative,[29] a comparison is made with other ancient sayings collections. This paves the way for Kloppenborg's formal conclusions regarding the composition of Q, namely that the earliest stratum was an *Instruction*, specifically belonging to the category of *gnomologium*.[30] To this was added the prophetic layer, transforming the work into a *chriae* collection.[31] Finally, a biographical element was added, moving the collection towards the category of *bios*.[32]

John Dominic Crossan: The Historical Jesus *and* The Birth of Christianity

The significance of John Dominic Crossan as a New Testament scholar extends far outside the realm of the Academy. His works have found a wide audience in the popular marketplace and his profile as one of the leading members of the *Jesus Seminar* has ensured that his voice has been heard throughout the media. For our study, the two most important works are *The Historical Jesus*[33] and *The Birth of Christianity*.[34] In both of these works, Crossan explicitly draws on the work of Kloppenborg outlined above,[35] integrating that work into his own methodology and bringing it to bear on the question of the historical Jesus.[36] Following

---

[28] Ibid., 243.

[29] Ibid., 246–25. Kloppenborg sees this narrative as a final redactional layer in Q.

[30] Ibid., 317–322. For his discussion of the categories "instruction," and "gnomologium," see ibid., 263–306.

[31] Ibid., 322–325.

[32] Ibid., 325–328.

[33] John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991).

[34] Idem, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Death of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).

[35] See especially Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 220–230 and *Birth of Christianity*, 249–252. In the latter volume Crossan acknowledges that if Kloppenborg's work is wrong (along with that of a number of other scholars such as J.A.M. Robinson), then his own work is also wrong (116).

[36] That methodology is outlined in the prologue to Crossan, *Historical Jesus.* He speaks of three triads that he will employ:

Kloppenborg's divorce of sapiential and prophetic/apocalyptic elements, and integrating that perspective into his socio-cultural analysis he argues, "When we cross apocalyptic and sapiential with scribes and peasants, it becomes necessary to locate Jesus in the quadrant formed by sapiential and peasant."[37]

Again, here, the sapiential element is understood primarily as involving hortatory ethical teaching. Indeed in the latter of his two works, Crossan ceases to speak of *sapiential* eschatology and speaks instead of *ethical eschatology*.[38] The ethics are, as in Kloppenborg, the ethics of *poverty*, although Crossan sees Jesus not as *demanding* dispossession but *presuming* it.[39] And, once again as with Kloppenborg, the emphasis within that poverty is on *non-violent* resistance, which for Crossan becomes located around the healing ministry and fellowship meals of Jesus and the early church.[40]

Where Crossan moves significantly beyond Kloppenborg is in his view that *apocalyptic* eschatology and *sapiential/ethical* eschatology are not simply redactionally distinct, but actually mutually corrosive. In his earlier volume, this idea is expressed in his argument that Jesus changed in

---

1. "The first triad involves the reciprocal interplay of a macroscosmic level using cross-cultural and cross-temporal social *anthropology*, a mesocosmic level using Hellenistic or Greco-Roman *history*, and a microcosmic level using the *literature* of specific sayings and doings, stories and anecdotes, confessions and interpretations concerning Jesus." (xxviii).
2. "The second triad focuses specifically on that textual problem derived from the very nature of the Jesus tradition itself. The first step is *inventory*…of all the major sources and texts, both intracanonical and extracanonical, to be used…The second step is *stratification*, the positioning of each source or text in a chronological sequence…The third step is *attestation.* This loops back to the inventory but presents that now stratified data base in terms of multiplicity of independent attestation for each complex of the Jesus tradition within those sources or texts." (xxxi).
3. The third triad "focuses on the methodological manipulation of that inventory." The first of its three elements "involves a focus on the sequence of strata… this step emphasizes the tremendous importance of that first stratum. It is, in terms of methodological discipline, dated chronologically closest to the time of Jesus…The second element…is *hierarchy of attestation.* My methodology begins with the first stratum and, within it, with those complexes having the highest count of independent attestation…The final element is *bracketing of singularity.* This entails the complete avoidance of any unit found only in single attestation, even in the first stratum." (xxxii).

[37] Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 292.

[38] I shall discuss the use of the term *eschatology* below, including Crossan's distinctive usage.

[39] Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, 281.

[40] Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 303–353, and *Birth of Christianity*, 423–445.

his view of John the Baptist: "John's vision of awaiting the apocalyptic God, the Coming One, as a repentant sinner, which Jesus had originally accepted and even defended in the crisis of John's death, was no longer deemed adequate. It was now a question of being in the Kingdom."[41] In Crossan's latter volume, this distinction becomes even more stark: "There is . . . counterevidence to any claim that a nonapocalyptic eschatology came first and an apocalyptic one developed only later. The earliest *non*apocalyptic eschatology I can find is already an *anti*-apocalyptic one."[42]

Interestingly, in the pages leading up to this statement, Crossan has argued that the inherent tension between the two eschatologies stems from their different views of the character of God:

> The marriage of apocalypticism and ethicism is a much more difficult and delicate issue. Can they be combined? As long as apocalypticism involves a God who uses force and violence to end force and violence, they cannot be combined; one has to choose between them . . . Ethicism . . . is absolute faith in a nonviolent God and the attempt to live and act in union with such a God.[43]

From this, and in open contrast to both the *inaugurated eschatology* of J.P. Meier[44] and the *restoration eschatology* of E.P. Sanders,[45] Crossan presents Jesus as endorsing an *ethical* eschatology in absolute distinction to an *apocalyptic* one. Given the elements that he stresses as programmatic to the ethics of Jesus, this leads him to see Jesus as remarkably like a Cynic:

> I find the general comparison of Cynicism's and Jesus' anti-materialist and anti-imperialist criticism to be helpful. I would use the term *ethical eschatology* to describe *both* those programs and that comparison helps me to distinguish them from *ascetical* or *apocalyptic eschatology* . . . If . . . pagans heard Jesus speaking about the kingdom of God, how would they have understood his program? Some sort of Cynicism, surely.[46]

This conclusion has, of course, been modified over the years by Crossan, with the connection between Jesus and the Cynics increasingly depicted as loose and indirect.[47] Nevertheless, the core of Crossan's approach

---

[41] Ibid., 237–238.
[42] Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, 305.
[43] Ibid., 287.
[44] Cited and criticised in ibid., 145–146.
[45] Cited and criticised in ibid., 339–342.
[46] Ibid., 334–335.
[47] See Crossan, *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994), 121–22.

has remained unchanged and the fundamental tension he sees between wisdom and apocalyptic remains basic to his project.

Key Issues in Kloppenborg and Crossan

From the discussion above, we can isolate three points common to the arguments of Kloppenborg and Crossan. Neither scholar would be offended at the identification of these points and both would agree that they are of fundamental importance to their arguments.

1. Both argue for an evident stratification in the Gospel sources in which the earliest stratum may be designated *sapiential*.
2. Both see in that earliest stratum a realised eschatology that precludes any future elements.
3. Both see that sapiential material as being heavily influenced by Graeco-Roman culture, both in terms of form (Kloppenborg's gnomologia) and content (Crossan's Cynicism).

These views cannot be ignored by scholars of Judaism: they concern the formative stages of Christianity, as it began to emerge as a distinct movement within Judaism and as such must be understood in relation to the latter as, indeed, a specific manifestation of the latter. Two questions, however, must be asked. First, is the tension they see between realised and future eschatologies defensible in the context of ancient Judaism? Second, can we really make use of form and ethics as means of distinguishing strata that correspond to distinct eschatologies?

Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility

As a starting point to answering these questions, we may consider an article by John J. Collins, entitled "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility."[48] Collins approaches the question of the relationship of

[48] John J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (ed. L. Perdue, B.B. Scott and W.J. Wiseman; Lousville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 165–185. Collins here critiques the views of Kloppenborg and Burton L. Mack, whose viewpoint is very similar to that of Crossan. See Burton L. Mack, *The Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 59–60.

wisdom and apocalyptic in the gospels in the light of other Jewish texts from the period and stresses that the question cannot be settled on the basis of form, but by examination also of the worldviews underlying those forms.

Collins begins by distinguishing five broad types of sapiential material: wisdom sayings, theological wisdom (such as reflections on theodicy), nature wisdom, mantic wisdom and higher wisdom through revelation.[49] He stresses that the presence of one or more of these types in any piece of literature does not establish continuity with another piece of literature containing a different type. Thus, the mantic wisdom found in Daniel is not continuous with the wisdom sayings or theological wisdom of Proverbs. Furthermore, he argues, the worldview that underlies the first three types of wisdom, as they are found in the wisdom books of the Hebrew Bible, is distinctive:

> This worldview involves more than a point of orientation. It also involves a set of assumptions about the universe. It affirms a world where there is an organic connection between cause and effect; where human fulfilment, such as it is, is to be found in this life; and where wisdom can be found from accumulated experience without course to special revelation… The question arises, however, whether the characteristic forms of wisdom literature were necessarily wedded to that worldview, and this question is crucial for the relation between biblical wisdom and apocalypticism.[50]

Collins continues by contrasting the worldview of the early apocalypses with that of the biblical wisdom books in three crucial respects:

1. The increased importance of the supernatural world.
2. The expectation of eschatological judgement and reward or punishment beyond death.
3. The perception that something is fundamentally wrong with this world.[51]

With regard to the last point, Collins stresses that in the apocalypses this sense of *anomie* is never total; there is still some kind of order in the cosmos.

With these preliminary points borne in mind, Collins then turns his attention to some of the places where sapiential material appears in an

[49] Ibid., 168.
[50] Ibid., 169–70.
[51] Ibid., 171.

apocalyptic context.[52] He stresses the absence of collections of *declarative sayings* in the apocalypses, but notes that "there is however a place for instructions and admonitions in the apocalypses and these sometimes have a sapiential character."[53] In particular, Collins examines some of the passages classified as *testaments*[54] as they occur in *1* and *2 Enoch* and in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* He concludes his discussion of them as follows:

> The ethical teaching of the testament is sapiential, undergirded by the experience of the patriarch. That experience, however, is understood in the light of the apocalyptic worldview…The wisdom tradition provides the ethical focus of the testament; the apocalyptic tradition provides the explanatory frame, the larger context of meaning.[55]

Having discussed the influence of wisdom texts on apocalyptic material, Collins then proceeds with a much briefer discussion of apocalyptic influence on wisdom texts, here discussing the *Damascus Document* and a text unearthed in the Cairo Geniza.[56] In the latter text, which is in the form of an *instruction* or *exhortation*, he discusses particularly the dualism it exhibits and also the emphasis on judgement, concluding:

> The importance of this text for our purpose is that it shows that the traditional form of the wisdom instruction could be adapted to an apocalyptic worldview, similar to what we find at Qumran, although examples of such adaptation are rare. The form of sapiential sayings is not necessarily tied to a this-worldly ideology, such as we find in Proverbs. The forms of wisdom speech are adaptable and may be used in the service of more than one worldview.[57]

Collins closes his essay by bringing some of this discussion to bear on the conclusions of Kloppenborg. He notes that there is no necessary generic antithesis between sapiential and apocalyptic material[58] and highlights that the particular wisdom forms identified as prevalent in Q by Kloppenborg (the *admonition* form) are, in any case, those found most

---

[52] Ibid., 174–179. The texts examined are the second Sibylline Oracle, *1* and *2 Enoch* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*

[53] Ibid., 174.

[54] For his discussion of this form, see ibid., 178.

[55] Ibid., 179.

[56] Collins interacts with a study on this text by Klaus Berger, *Die Weisheitsschriftaus der Kairoer Geniza: Erstedition, Kommentar und Übersetzung* (Tübingen: Franke, 1989).

[57] Ibid., 181.

[58] Ibid., 182.

commonly in apocalypses.[59] He criticises Kloppenborg's attempts to reconstruct the worldview lying behind the texts[60] before concluding:

> Kloppenborg is surely right that a major component of Q can be appropriately categorized as 'wisdom speeches.' There is no generic incompatibility, however, between these speeches and an apocalyptic worldview. Accordingly the sharp redaction-critical separation of the sapiential speeches from the announcement of judgement should be viewed with some suspicion and will need to be evaluated critically.[61]

Collins's article establishes a key point crucial to any research on the relationship between wisdom and apocalyptic: there is no "generic incompatibility" between these elements. This point has recently been developed with respect to Q by Matthew J. Goff,[62] who, in the light of *4QInstruction*, to which a chapter of this volume is dedicated, has challenged a number of the assumptions made about the development of sapiential literature in Judaism during the Second Temple period. Specifically he has seen the hybridisation of sapiential and apocalyptic elements in Q as something to be expected in works of the time:

> While there are significant differences between *4QInstruction* and Q, both draw on the wisdom tradition in terms of genre and the sapiential and apocalyptic traditions in terms of content. Q is in continuity with a stream of the wisdom tradition characterized by influence from the apocalyptic tradition.[63]

Consequently, the question of how they relate to one another must move beyond the simplistic association of form and genre and examine—as Collins suggests—the concepts that underlie a text. It is on this level of textual examination that answers are to be found as to how sapiential and apocalyptic elements might relate to one another within a given work. Specifically, if we are considering variegated texts and asking why both sapiential and apocalyptic elements are employed within them, we may find answers in the underlying concepts, such as in their soteriology. In approaching this question, however, we must be cautious to ensure a proper identification of the concepts underlying a text: these

---

[59] Ibid., 182.

[60] Here, Collins is interacting more with Kloppenborg's article, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," *HTR* 80 (1987) 287–306.

[61] Collins, "Generic Compatibility," 185.

[62] M.J. Goff, "Discerning Trajectories: *4QInstruction* and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Gospel Q," *JBL* 124 (2005), 657–73.

[63] Ibid., 673.

concepts must be clearly betrayed, either by the use of language in the text under consideration, or by the shape of the narrative in that text.

In Pursuit of Commonality

As mentioned already, a huge amount of literature has appeared over the last ten years that has examined the relationship of wisdom and apocalyptic in the context of ancient Judaism.[64] While a small number of articles appearing in these works have sought to establish common tendencies in variegated texts, or to isolate underlying concepts[65] the attention of this endeavour has largely been focused on the specific details of isolated texts or has taken the form of a comparative study of two texts,[66] doubtless because most of the material has been delivered in the form of papers at symposia and conferences, without the opportunity to devote time or space to a wider comparative study. Such articles have been enormously stimulating and helpful, but have left largely unexplored the question of whether there are broader conceptual commonalities in the literature.

In particular, it seems to me that the concept of "revealed wisdom," an obvious candidate to be examined in this way, has received insufficient attention as a pivotal element in eschatology. One notable exception to this generalisation is an article by George W.E. Nickelsburg entitled, "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees

---

[64] A cross section of these includes: Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller (eds), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000); Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange and Hermann Lichtenberger, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002); F. García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

[65] For example, F. García Martínez, "Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?" in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, 1–16. Alexander Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements (STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 1–12; Menahem Kister, "Wisdom literature and its Relation to other Genres: From Ben Sira to *Mysteries*," in Collins *et al., Sapiential Perpectives*, 13–48; John J. Collins, "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Collins et al., *Sapiential Perspectives*, 49–66.

[66] John J. Collins, "The Mysteries of God. Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon." in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, 287–306; Daniel J. Harrington, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4Ezra," in ibid., 343–55.

and Some Qumranic Documents,"[67] in which he argues that the possession of revealed wisdom is constitutive of the elect eschatological community in the texts examined. As this study progresses, it will become clear that I regard the concept of revealed wisdom as central to the eschatology of the texts that I have studied and as a key explanatory concept for the co-mingling of sapiential and apocalyptic elements in these texts. In this sense, my whole thesis may be seen as an expansion and elaboration of Nickelsburg's observations, although his article, ironically, was one that I came to late in the process, after most of my research was complete.

In pursuing commonalities, however, a balance must be struck between depth and breadth. It would be easy to embark on a project examining a great swathe of literature in little depth, citing "parallel" texts at every opportunity and drawing on the insights of contemporary scholars, but this would be methodologically questionable: the inner dynamics of each text would be lost in the midst of the generalisations. We would run the risk of flattening the diversity of texts that may, in some ways, be radically—or even polemically—different. Instead, a small number of texts must be selected and examined in some detail. In the context of such a study, both commonality and distinctiveness may be noted. Where a clear and accepted chronology exists, continuity and evolution may also be observed.

This last point brings us back to the point where we began. Kloppenborg and Crossan have made a case for redactional tension between sapiential and apocalyptic elements in the context of one branch of ancient Judaism: that of nascent Christianity. This raises the issue of whether the commonalities observed in the contexts of Second Temple Jewish texts continue to be found in specifically Christian texts. If they *are* to be found in the actual text witnesses we possess, as distinct from hypothetically reconstructed traditions, then perhaps we may challenge some of the criteria employed by Kloppenborg, Crossan and others in determining the texts' pre-history.

---

[67] George W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees and Some Qumranic Documents," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, with the collaboration of Avital Pinnick (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 91–119.

Choosing Texts

Which texts, then, will form the basis for this study? I have already suggested the importance of limiting our study to a small number of texts; I will, therefore, consider four, although one of these texts is, in actuality, a collection of works. These texts will represent Jewish and Christian thought. In the former category, I will consider some of the books in *1 Enoch* and the wisdom text *4QInstruction.* In the latter, I will consider the Gospel of Matthew and *2 Enoch.* Including *2 Enoch* in this latter category may be surprising to those who would regard the Slavonic apocalypse as Jewish but, as I shall argue later, while the origins of *2 Enoch* are mysterious, its transmission is not (at least, not to the same extent). It has undoubtedly been transmitted in Christian contexts and therefore, whatever it may say about Jewish thought, it contributes to our awareness of the persistence of ideas in the literature transmitted by Christians and the character that they had during that transmission.

The texts have not been chosen randomly. *1 Enoch* is universally acknowledged as being apocalyptic in character, yet it also contains a great many features most at home in the sapiential category. Conversely, *4QInstruction* is a sapiential work with a great many apocalyptic features. They are both, therefore, variegated, but in rather different ways. A consideration of these two texts thus pushes us beyond simple questions of *genre.*

The Gospel of Matthew was the original subject matter of my doctoral work, but its presence here is not simply a consequence of that fact. As I shall note in the chapter devoted to the gospel, scholars have argued for an increased importance of both sapiential and apocalyptic elements in Matthew, although the question of how these might function in relation to one another has been ignored. Moreover, while there is no scholarly consensus as to whether the work was authored by a Jew or in the context of Jewish Christianity, "virtually every commentator on Matthew will affirm that this Gospel has strong roots in Judaism and is concerned with issues of traditional importance to Judaism."[68] It is, then, possible that concepts observed in the context of *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction* will also be seen in Matthew, as exemplary of a kind of Christianity still closely linked with Judaism.

---

[68] Donald Senior, "Directions in Matthean Studies," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*, edited by David E. Aune, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001),11.

Regarding, finally, *2 Enoch*: the Slavonic apocalypse drew my attention in the first place because it contains a great deal of sapiential material. Moreover, in a number of places that material bears a strong resemblance to that found in Matthew. As noted already, the origins of the apocalypse are obscure and certainty regarding these is still some way off; if it can be demonstrated that the work is both early and Jewish then my study will make a fascinating contribution to our understanding of early Judaism. In the absence of such certainty, however, it still has an important contribution to make, reminding us that Jewish eschatological ideas continued to be transmitted in Christian environments. This, of course, leaves open the question regarding the extent to which such ideas were consciously processed, as opposed to simply being copied. To such a question, my study can only provide a starting point.

A study of this kind will make a rather limited contribution to the field, and its results must be treated with caution. We will study a very small number of texts and, as such, have a slender basis upon which to make generalisations. Nevertheless, it will, I think, stimulate further discussion of the issues raised and ought to facilitate comparative study with other texts. In other words, I hope that it will encourage further study into the role that inaugurated eschatology and revealed wisdom play in other texts.

Terms, Concepts and Definitions

Before this study can continue, some discussion of the categories of wisdom and apocalypse is required in order to allow some terminological definitions to be set out. Such definitions are necessitated by the lack of consistency with which scholars use the words "wisdom," "apocalypse" and "eschatology" and their various cognates, a problem easily seen within the excursus above. In the light of such inconsistency and disagreement over the precise meaning of terms, it seems to me that the primary responsibility of the scholar is to be transparent in the adoption of definitions and, as far as possible, consistent to the definitions that have been adopted. It is hoped that the following discussion will make clear the definitions that will be operative in the present work.

Apocalypse/Apocalyptic

As John Collins notes, the "notion that there is a class of writings that may be labelled 'apocalyptic' has been generally accepted since Frederick Lücke published the first comprehensive study of the subject in 1832."[69] In addition to the biblical books of Daniel and Revelation, the body of writings that is generally seen as belonging to this category is as follows: *1 Enoch, 2 Enoch, Jubilees, 2 Baruch, 3 Baruch, 4 Ezra* (*2 Esdras*), *Apocalypse of Abraham, Testament of Abraham, Testament of Levi, Testament of Naphtali, Ascension of Isaiah, Shepherd of Hermas, 3 Enoch*.[70] In addition, certain parts of Ezekiel (the chariot vision of chapter 1 and the temple vision of chapters 40–48) are usually seen as reflecting the emergence of the genre.

Since the genre first drew the attention of scholarship, various proposals have been made concerning its origins. Some have seen the genre rising from the collision of Jewish ideas with Babylonian ones, particularly the idea of mantic wisdom;[71] others have seen a Persian background as providing the key.[72] Collins, noting the presence also of Hellenistic ideas in the apocalypses, is probably correct in seeing the genre as rising from the melting pot of the Hellenistic milieu.[73]

The most widely accepted definition of the term "apocalypse" is that offered in *Semeia 14* by John J. Collins:

---

[69] Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2–3. Lücke's work is *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johanis und in die gesamte apokalyptische Literatur* (Bonn: Weber, 1832).

[70] I have taken this list of works from Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 15. I am deliberately avoiding the descriptor "Jewish" at this point: some apocalypses often regarded as Jewish may well be Christian and this should affect the way in which they are used by biblical scholars.

[71] For example James VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 (Washington D.C., Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); H.P. Müller, "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik," in Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971, VTSup 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 268–293. Gerhard von Rad, of course, famously saw the genre as being derived from Jewish wisdom speculation, but this view was essentially based on the presence of "wisdom" language in Daniel, the mantic associations of which he neglected. For von Rad's proposal, see *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (2 vols, 4th ed., Munich: Kaiser, 1965), 2:315–330. For criticism, see Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 5, 20–1, 39, 92.

[72] See Anders Hultgård, "Persian Apocalypticism," in *the Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, edited by John J. Collins, (New York, London: Continuum, 2000), 39–83.

[73] See, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 33–7.

> "Apocalypse" is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.[74]

The emphasis on eschatology in this definition has been questioned by some, with the works of Rowland[75] and Himmelfarb,[76] in particular, arguing that the key element of the genre is revelation, which may or may not include eschatology.[77] Without making any final judgement on whether these last two scholars are correct, it is certainly the case that acknowledging the pre-eminence of the revelatory aspect as constitutive of the genre allows the scholar to transcend the possibly artificial distinction between "historical" and "visionary" apocalypses.[78] With this caveat regarding the role of eschatology in place, the definition provided by Collins is the one that will be accepted and followed in the present work. Collins himself regards this definition as indicating the "common core of the genre,"[79] and thus more constitutive of all apocalypses than Koch's list of apocalyptic literary features.[80] Nevertheless, Koch's list

---

[74] John J. Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia 14, 9*. For a more complete discussion of the generic issues, see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 1–42.

[75] Rowland, *The Open Heaven.* See, especially, pages 9–48. A good summary of Rowland's position is found on page 26, where, regarding eschatology, he writes: "its presence in them is not their most distinctive feature, nor does it deserve to become the focus of attention in the study of apocalyptic to the exclusion of the other secrets which the apocalypses claim to reveal."

[76] Martha T. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[77] Related to the visionary character of the apocalypses is, of course, the question of the function and phenomenon of pseudepigraphy. Specifically, is the association of the visionary experiences with an ancient figure a mere fiction intended to lend credibility to the work, or does a more complex identification exist between the author and that figure. The answer to this question may vary from work to work; it is, in any case, beyond the purposes of this study to answer it. For a discussion of the various views on this issue, see Orton, *The Understanding Scribe*, 112–114.

[78] This distinction continues to be accepted by scholars. See, for instance, F. García Martínez, "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," pages 162–192 in *The Encyclopaedia of Apocalypticism, Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. John J. Collins; New York: Continuum, 2000). As a way of establishing sub-categories of apocalypse, there is nothing wrong with the distinction, but a definition of the genre as a whole must be capable of including *both* types. It seems best, therefore, to give the idea of revelation primacy, and to de-emphasise eschatology, recognizing the text-specific nature of the latter feature.

[79] *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 5.

[80] Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (SBT 2/22 London: SCM, 1972), 28–33.

and Sim's development of it[81] remain useful as a diagnostic tool, a kind of "list of symptoms" indicating the presence of elements in a text most commonly associated with the apocalyptic genre.

Based on Collins's definition, only exemplars of a well-defined body of literature can be categorised as "apocalypses"; Matthew, for example, cannot be classified as such. Nevertheless, other works may contain elements that are characteristic of the apocalyptic genre and most commonly associated with that genre. Where this is the case, we may use the adjective "apocalyptic" with justification, though also with some caution, acknowledging that there may be other backgrounds to a concept other than that of the genre apocalypse. The prophetic tradition, more broadly, may function as the donor of a given idea.

Where we must be cautious is in using the word "apocalyptic" to denote a worldview or a movement. Such a use of the term has been noted above in the work of Kloppenborg and Crossan and is also strongly associated with the research of Paolo Sacchi.[82] The work of Sacchi in unravelling the ideological roots of the genre is important, but it is questionable whether the term "apocalyptic" should have been used by him to denote this ideology, since it creates a greater level of confusion over whether a given apocalypse is "apocalyptic," according to his definition, at all.[83] A more general problem with such a usage of the adjective is that it can assume a consistency in the worldview that lies behind the genre taken as a whole, a dangerous assumption to make.[84] Providing these concerns are noted, however, and providing we are careful not to add to the confusion, I think the term "apocalyptic" can still be used to speak of ideologies or movements, as long as these are explored or defined in reference to apocalypses.

---

[81] See appendix.

[82] P. Sacchi, *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua Storia* (Brescia: Paideia, 1990).

[83] Boccaccini's distinction between Zadokite and Enochic Judaism seems more constructive and bypasses this confusion. See *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1998), *in toto.*

[84] See the discussion in Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E–200 C.E.*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 126–131. The use of the term "apocalyptic" to denote a worldview or movement has recently received further attention in the context of the discussions of Enochic Judaism and of the Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran origins, notably in the volume *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, edited by Gabrielle Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); see especially the comments of James R. Davila, "The Animal Apocalypse and Daniel," pages 35–39. F. García Martínez, of course, has often employed the term in the context of the latter theory. See, for example, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988) 113–36.

Wisdom/Sapiential

According to Collins, "the category of wisdom literature is identified in modern scholarship primarily with the books of Proverbs, Qoheleth and Job in the Hebrew Bible and the apocryphal or deuterocanonical books of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus) and the Wisdom of Solomon."[85] The basis for the association of these diverse books is, he continues, the high density of references to "wisdom" (חכמה or σοφία) in these books:

> Like most traditional scholarly categories, however, 'wisdom' is not identified by a systematic literary analysis, but is an impressionistic, intuitive grouping of books that seem to have something in common. Those who have attempted to define just what they have in common have found the task surprisingly difficult.[86]

This is an important comment, one that should give any scholar reason to pause before passing judgement on whether a given form is "sapiential" or whether there is such a thing as a "sapiential worldview." The humility embodied in Collins's statement is one that the present study will seek to reflect: the term "wisdom literature" will be used to refer to the works listed above, with the adjective "sapiential" being related to this. No single "sapiential" worldview will be assumed, but it will be acknowledged that the various ideologies that lie behind the wisdom texts all give some kind of pre-eminence to what they refer to as "wisdom," even though they may construe that wisdom in different ways: thus, a concern in a text such as Matthew to present Jesus, or his teaching, as "wisdom" may be described as sapiential.

In terms of form, I will suggest in this study that the formal generic distinctions dissolve under the influence of certain underlying concepts which lead to the fusion of forms and ideas from different traditions. Nevertheless, two points may be noted as being of particular importance to the chapters that will follow.

First, what is striking about the formal associations of the wisdom literature is not so much the occurrence or preponderance of certain forms, but rather the extent to which form *in general* predominates stylistically. The words of J.L. Crenshaw help to clarify this point:

---

[85] John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 1.

[86] Ibid., 1.

> Formally wisdom consists of proverbial sentence or instruction, debate, intellectual reflection; thematically wisdom comprises self-evident intuitions about mastering life for human betterment, groping after life's secrets with regard to innocent suffering, grappling with finitude, and quest for truth concealed in the created order and manifested in Dame Wisdom. *When a marriage between form and content exists, there is wisdom literature. Lacking such oneness, a given text participates in biblical wisdom to a greater or lesser extent.*[87]

The italicised words highlight the importance of what we might describe as "form for form's sake" to the category. Were we to scan the works generally regarded as belonging to the category, one of the most obvious features would be a tendency to arrange material in a highly stylised fashion.[88]

Second, while a diversity of forms may be employed by the wisdom teachers, and a great deal of space could be devoted to examining these, many of these may be subsumed under a single term: *mashal.* This term lies behind the Greek term παραβολῆ and possesses a "broad semantic field"[89] that may include figurative sayings, metaphors, similes, parables, parabolic stories, illustrative stories and allegory.[90] Birger Gerhardsson, commenting on the range of forms of speech denoted by the term *parable* or *mashal*, provides a list similar to that above and states that all such forms are "distinguished by their skilful formulation from flat everyday speech."[91] An element of comparison is common in the form, although some have questioned whether it should be seen as constitutive of it.[92]

It is important not to regard *meshalim* as exclusively or essentially sapiential forms: the importance of *parallelismus membrorum* to the form

---

[87] J.L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Atlanta; John Knox Press, 1981), 19. Emphasis mine.

[88] See Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature," who notes Ben Sira's use of couplets (292) and Pseudo-Phocylides' use of dactylic hexameters (315).

[89] C.H. Peisker, "Παραβολή" *NIDNTT*, 2: 747

[90] This list of forms covered by the term has been taken from Alistair Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen: Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21–25* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 196. I will follow Wilson and others in preferring the term *mashal* to *parable* simply because the latter term has, by virtue of its use in English, certain formal connotations that the former, by being used less commonly, manages to escape. There may be many sayings in the Gospel that we would not instinctively categorise as parables that should, nevertheless, be understood as such. The use of *mashal* escapes this formal prejudice. It would be impossible and artificial, however, to avoid the term *parable* altogether and so at points in this thesis the term will occur.

[91] B. Gerhardsson, "Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels," in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. H. Wansborough; JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 266–309.

[92] So Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen*, 196.

certainly creates a strong link with wisdom literature,[93] but there are no parallels to the narrative *meshalim* in that tradition.[94] Despite this caveat, however, it remains the case that in Matthew's Gospel, where we will encounter such narratives in our study, the form clearly has sapiential significance. The *mashal* of the two builders (7:24–27) presents itself as being concerned with wisdom, since the two builders are wise and foolish respectively, a fact that could be echoed for the *mashal* of the ten virgins (25: 1–13). The discussion of Jesus' use of parables (13:11–17, 23) foregrounds the connection of the genre as used by Jesus with "understanding," though as I shall argue below, this actually represents a fusion with revelatory ideas. It is unsurprising, then, that in the course of his narrative Matthew links Jesus' use of *meshalim* to his authority as a teacher.[95] In particular, the way in which Jesus' teaching clearly draws on everyday speech but, as Gerhardsson suggests, skilfully turns this into something more is evidence of his sagacity. The fact that Matthew foregrounds this aspect of Jesus teaching by gathering these *meshalim* into thematic clusters is part of the way in which he presents Jesus as a Sage.

The comparative element within the *meshalim* may be worth considering a little further. Matthew Goff comments that the "worldly focus of biblical wisdom . . . encourages the pursuit of natural analogies,"[96] a statement that draws upon his preceding discussion of the sense of order within creation attested, in particular, by Proverbs 8. This sense of order undergirds the "Tat-Ergehen-Zusammenhang," the act-consequence relationship: the world has been created to work in a certain fashion and reflection upon the created order shows that certain actions will be followed by certain consequences.[97] Works like Qoheleth and Job seem to wrestle with some kind of "crisis of wisdom,"[98] struggling with the implications of this view and with the inconsistency of reality

---

[93] As noted by Martin Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 90.

[94] See Witherington, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 158.

[95] See especially 7:28 and, less strongly, 13:54.

[96] Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 43.

[97] As far as I know the phrase "Tat-Ergehen-Zusammenhang" goes back to Klaus Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?" *ZTK* 52 (1955), 1–42.

[98] For the idea of such a "crisis," see K. Galling, *Die Krise der Aufklärung in Israel* (Mainzer Universitätsreden 19; Mainz: Verlag der Johannes Gutenbergbuchhandlung, 1952). J. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 196, notes that scepticism towards the act-consequence wisdom is well-attested in, for example, Isaiah 5:18–19 and Zephaniah 1:12, and therefore suggests that the terminology of a "crisis of wisdom" is misleading.

with it. But these books, while on one level attesting a "counter-order wisdom,"[99] address a problem that stems from the basic conviction that the world has been made in a particular way. As Witherington notes, the absurdity of life "is a problem for Qoheleth precisely because he is a theist."[100] This is an important issue to flag, since the idea that creation is ordered according to the foundations of Wisdom underlies both the tendency to make use of natural analogies and the preoccupation of sapiential literature with the act-consequence relationship. As we examine the various texts that will be studied in this work, it will be helpful to bear in mind that natural analogies are characteristic of wisdom literature's creation theology and that both the act-consequence relationship and the various approaches to dealing with its problems have their roots in that same creation theology.

One last issue that requires to be discussed under this heading is the question of whether wisdom is increasingly "hypostasised" in the sapiential tradition, thus becoming Wisdom.[101] Such an idea has already been noted in the works surveyed above that propose a Matthean "Wisdom-Christology." The idea that wisdom is hypostatised is well-established and is discussed at length by Witherington,[102] who is appropriately cautious in distinguishing earlier stages of this process from latter ones. He notes that in Proverbs wisdom simply seems to be personified,[103] that Sirach 24 develops this personification and that only in Wisdom of Solomon does it appear to have become an independent *hypostasis*.[104] Robert Hammerton-Kelly has argued that such Wisdom was regarded as pre-existent within Judaism and therefore provided a useful category for Christian writers to depict the pre-existence of Jesus;[105] Burnett, after him,[106] sees the myth of Wisdom's rejection as background to the Matthean depiction of the rejection of Jesus by Israel. Some caution should be applied here: the rejection of Wisdom is primarily attested by *1 Enoch* 42:1–2, which may well reflect an older, more widespread myth, but it may also reflect a distinctive innovation of the author of the

---

[99] See Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 59.
[100] Ibid., 60.
[101] For an overview, see Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature," 287–88. From here on I shall denote only personified/hypostasised wisdom as Wisdom.
[102] Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 36–114.
[103] Ibid., 36–49.
[104] Ibid., 108–11.
[105] Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man*, 19–21.
[106] Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia*, 94–8.

Similitudes. Nevertheless, the idea that wisdom is personified or hypostasised is well-attested and will be important to bear in mind.

Eschatology/Eschatological

The noun *eschatology* properly refers to the ἔσχατον or *period of the last things*. The term, then, essentially refers to end-time expectation.[107] What that expectation might be may vary from group to group, as well as the question of where the group stands in relation to that fulfilment. Thus, the term requires some modification according to context: eschatology may be *realised* or *futurist* or *inaugurated* or perhaps modified by another phrase. Most writers have used these adjectives with an awareness that they are not necessarily in tension with one another: a given text may exhibit a realised eschatology, even though it also exhibits future expectations. Thus, for instance, Torleif Elgvin, whose work on *4QInstruction* we will consider, speaks of a *realised eschatology* in that text, while also pointing out that, "an eschatological discourse on the coming judgement occupies a full two columns of the work."[108] For Elgvin, a realised eschatology need not be entirely realised, it may anticipate a time of consummation.

But we encounter a problem precisely because of the way in which the language of eschatology has been used by scholars such as Kloppenborg and Crossan. As noticed above, these scholars have polarised realised and future eschatologies (the latter designated as "apocalyptic") and assigned them to separate strata. For them, to speak of a realised eschatology is to speak of a view in which the kingdom has already come and which therefore rejects the expectation of a coming judgement. Clearly, this is a different use of the phrase to that of Elgvin. Such contradictory uses of the same terminology can only lead to confusion and it is for this reason that within the present work I shall employ the phrase "inaugurated eschatology" to denote an eschatology that con-

---

[107] I would wish to contrast this use of the terminology with that of Crossan, who at least makes his usage clear but surely pushes semantics by defining eschatology as *world-negation*, a definition that allows him to maintain his tension between an apocalyptic eschatology with real end-time expectation and a "sapiential" eschatology that is entirely realised. For his discussion see Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, 258–260.

[108] Torleif Elgvin, "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgement and Salvation According to Sapiential Work A." in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Leiden: Brill, 1996), 128.

tains both realised and future elements. This phrase shall be useful for two reasons. First, it escapes the confusion discussed above by avoiding the connotations that Kloppenborg and Crossan have given to the term "realised" and the contradiction that they have created between realised and apocalyptic eschatologies. Second, the term "inaugurated" may suggest the idea of a specific inaugural event, which is an idea that will be explored throughout this book.

While the study of each individual text should be the primary basis for our understanding of its eschatology, some notes of caution from Rowland deserve to be noted before we close this chapter. These concern the assumption that there is, in apocalyptic texts, an underlying dichotomy between the present time and the time to come. This assumption is probably best demonstrated by the influential words of Rowley:

> The prophets foretold the future that should arise out of the present, while the apocalyptists foretold the future that should break into the present . . . the apocalyptists had little faith in the present to beget the future.[109]

These words reflect a common assumption that requires, at this point, to be made explicit and then to be explicitly rejected as a presupposition. Rowland's caution is as follows:

> The emphasis on the future breaking into the present as a hallmark of apocalyptic, while not entirely absent in the apocalyptic literature, hardly summarises the varying features of the eschatological secrets. It must, therefore, be questioned whether a particular type of eschatology can so easily be used as the characteristic feature of the hope for the future in the apocalypses.[110]

Such a statement will be important, with regard to each of the texts, for the research that will be carried out within the present study. If a proper attempt is to be made to analyse the eschatologies of our four texts, then any prior assumptions regarding those eschatologies would prejudice the work. Perhaps any or all of the texts exhibit the kind of sharp dichotomy described by Rowley, but then again, perhaps none of them does.

---

[109] H.H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic; A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation* (London: Lutterworth, 1944), 38.

[110] Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 29.

CHAPTER TWO

1 ENOCH

In the course of the previous chapter, the suggestion of John Collins—that research on the relationship of wisdom and apocalypse must move beyond formal considerations to examine the underlying worldviews of texts—was noted. The present chapter is intended to take up Collins's suggestion and to examine the underlying concepts operative in some of the constituent books within the collection of works known as *1 Enoch*. The central argument that will be advanced within this chapter is that these sections of *1 Enoch* are marked by an eschatology that is best described as "inaugurated," within which the revealing of wisdom to a chosen group—who are thus set apart from the rest of Israel—plays a key role in that inauguration. Related to this thesis is the question of how the wisdom revealed to the chosen relates to Torah.

1 Enoch, also known as Ethiopic Enoch, is the name given to a sprawling corpus of works composed over several centuries.[1] The work is preserved now in complete form only in the Ethiopic language Geʿez, in a text dating from the fifth or sixth century C.E. That text, in turn, is probably based on a Greek translation[2] of the Aramaic original, this last work now attested by the Aramaic fragments found in Cave 4 at Qumran.[3]

Some kind of focus is required in approaching such an extensive corpus of material and so in the following study I shall consider first the

---

[1] For a discussion of the stages of composition, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108 by George Nickelsburg*, Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 25–26.

[2] For the Greek fragments of *1 Enoch* see M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece/Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

[3] For the Aramaic fragments, see J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976). While the Aramaic fragments provide important material for the textual criticism of *1 Enoch*, reconstructing the text requires the use of the later translations of the work. For a discussion of the textual bases for reconstructing *1 Enoch*, including the relative merits of the various mss., see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1:9–20. For the Ethiopic text, see volume 1 of Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

sections of *1 Enoch* that may have been linked in ancient Judaism into something like a *testament*. Following this, I shall consider The Parables or Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37–71), which are problematic for a number of reasons and require, therefore, to be treated separately. Largely because of their problematic character, I decided not to include a study of the Parables in my original doctoral research; I am glad to include a section on them here, however, as they make an important contribution to any study on revealed wisdom.

The possibility that there may, at one stage, have been an Enochic "testament" has been argued by George Nickelsburg, based on his consideration of the fragments from Qumran, together with the evidence of the book of *Jubilees*.[4] Two important initial points arise from analysis of the Qumran fragments. First, there is no evidence for the presence of the Book of the Similitudes or Parables (chapters 37–71) among the texts found at Qumran. Second, the Book of the Luminaries (chaps. 72–82), while attested among the fragments at Qumran, does not appear to have been copied together with the other parts of the corpus; it is always found on separate manuscripts. This would suggest that while it is probably the oldest of the Enochic material, it existed independently of the other parts of the Enochic corpus until a stage later than that attested by the Qumran fragments.

Examining further the evidence of those fragments, particularly that of 4QEn^{c} (4Q204),[5] Nickelsburg has suggested that there appears to have existed, at some stage, an Enochic testament, comprising the Book of the Watchers, the Dream Visions and the Epistle of Enoch:

> If we include 81:1–82:4ab, the three parts represented in 4QEn^{c} form a literary unity that has the character of a testament. A narrative section about Enoch's past activity leads to a farewell scene in which the father instructs his sons on ethical and eschatological matters that are related, in part, to the content of the narrative.[6]

---

[4] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1:9–10, 22–26.

[5] This fragment preserves parts of chapters 1–6, 10, 13–15, 18, 31–32, 35–36, 89, 104–107 as well as part of the Book of Giants.

[6] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 23. The "three parts" that Nickelsburg speaks of are the Book of the Watchers, the Dream Visions and the Epistle of Enoch. As can be seen from the list above, the fragment only preserves the second of the two dream visions found in chapters 83–89. No Aramaic fragment preserves the first vision, although the two visions are now bound together into a unity by 83:1–2. The well-attested second vision actually throws up greater textual problems. See ibid., p. 24. For a briefer discussion of the "Enochic testament" than that found in his *1 Enoch* commentary, see Nickelsburg's *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), pp. 150–151.

Argall agrees with Nickelsburg and, drawing upon the language of A.B. Kolenkow,[7] further qualifies this as being a "blessing-revelation testament,"[8] a description which draws attention to the portrayal of Enoch as a revealer of wisdom, about which I shall say more below.

Within this proposal, however, there remains a measure of doubt as to the precise extent of the contents of the testament. Dream Visions (chapters 83–90) is only attested in part (the first dream vision is entirely missing from the Aramaic manuscripts and the second is only partially represented) and much of the Epistle of Enoch is missing. Regarding the former omission, it is noteworthy that *Jubilees* 4:18–20 refers to material from chapters 85–90, in the context of a reference to Enoch's "testimony."[9] This suggests that at least the second dream vision was regarded as part of the testament. Regarding the latter omission, it is specifically 94:6–104:9 that is absent from the Aramaic fragments and there is a strong suggestion that 104:10 continues the line of thought of 94:5.[10] This suggests that there may have existed a "Proto-Epistle of Enoch,"[11] from which a great deal of what now constitutes the Epistle was missing. If this was indeed the case, it is striking that some of the most obviously "sapiential" material in the corpus was later inserted at this particular point in the corpus. This fact will be explored below; the salient point at this stage is that these two possible omissions make it appear likely that the Enochic testament itself underwent an evolutionary development.

Nickelsburg's suggestion of an Enochic Testament has been widely criticised. Soon after the publication of the *Hermeneia commentary*, Michael A. Knibb[12] and Annette Yoshiko Reed[13] rejected the thesis as being too simplistic. Subsequently, more sustained criticism has been made by

---

[7] A.B. Kolenkow, "The Genre Testament and Forecasts of the Future in the Hellenistic Jewish Milieu," *JSJ* 6 (1975), 57–71.

[8] R.A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation Creation and Judgement* (SBLEJL 8; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 17.

[9] See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 25.

[10] See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 24. Also, see Gabrielle Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 104–13.

[11] The phrase is Boccaccini's.

[12] M.A. Knibb, "Interpreting the Book of Enoch: Reflections on a Recently Published Commentary," *JSJ* 33 (2002), 439–42.

[13] A.Y. Reed, "The Textual Identity, Literary History, and Social Setting of 1 Enoch: Reflections on George Nickelsburg's Commentary on 1 Enoch 1–36; 81–108," *ARG* 5 (2003), 283–8.

John J. Collins,[14] James VanderKam[15] and, to some extent, Patrick Tiller,[16] in the context of the double-volume, *George Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. The common thread running through these is that Nickelsburg's understanding of 81–82, and of the original context and function of these, is regarded as "unduly speculative"[17] and as incapable of bearing the weight of the thesis. With admirable honesty, Nickelsburg responds to these with an admission of the speculative nature of his thesis:

> So what does one make of this erratic block (by everyone's account) lying as it does in the midst of a mass of astronomical lore in the Book of Luminaries? Whence may it have come? To put it honestly we don't know for certain, and so I have chosen to speculate.[18]

Nickelsburg continues in his response by modifying his language somewhat, presenting the early form of the Enoch corpus a "testamentary collection" rather than as a "testament" *per se*,[19] responding to Collins's criticism that his hypothetical Enochic testament does not properly fit within the formal category of "testament"[20] and suggesting that what we have here may be called "an experiment in form."[21]

Ultimately, then, even Nickelsburg himself would acknowledge that the idea of an Enochic testament is speculative, and most would agree with Patrick Tiller's comment that "Attempting to describe the literary shape of *1 Enoch* is like trying to hit a moving target. The collection was never static for very long."[22] Nevertheless, providing it is regarded with adequate caution, Nickelsburg's suggestion provides some useful

---

[14] John J. Collins, "An Enochic Testament? Comments on George Nickelsburg's Hermeneia Commentary," in *George Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (2 volumes; volume 2; ed. Jacob Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck, JSJSupp 80; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 373–8.

[15] J.C. VanderKam, "Response to George Nickelsburg, '1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108'" in Neusner and Avery-Peck, eds., *George Nickelsburg in Perspective*, 379–86.

[16] P.A. Tiller, "George Nickelsburg's '1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108'" in Neusner and Avery-Peck, eds., *George Nickelsburg in Perspective*, 365–72.

[17] Collins, "An Enochic Testament?" 376.

[18] G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Response on the Commentary on 1 Enoch," in Neusner and Avery-Peck, eds., *George Nickelsburg in Perspective*, 415.

[19] Collins, "An Enochic Testament?" 376–77

[20] Nickelsburg, "Response," 417.

[21] Ibid., 417.

[22] Tiller, "George Nickelsburg's '1 Enoch 1,'" 368.

parameters for the present study. At the very least, the manuscript evidence that Nickelsburg examines suggests that, in some sense, the Book of the Watchers, the Dream Visions and the Epistle of Enoch were from an early stage seen as belonging together or linked in some way while the Book of the Luminaries was seen as distinct. Our study will, therefore, focus on those three books, leaving aside the material found in the Book of the Luminaries and delaying the study of that found in the Similitudes.

As the foundational section within the collection, the study will initially focus on the Book of the Watchers. Once the nature of the eschatological teachings in that book have been established, I shall briefly note similarities in the teaching of the Dream Visions and the Epistle of Enoch before noting the interesting contribution of the Apocalypse of Weeks. Once the character of the eschatology of the testament has been established, questions of form and ethics may be explored. Only once the study of the Enochic Testament is complete will I examine the Book of Parables.

Part 1: Eschatology in the Enochic Testamentary Collection

The Book of the Watchers

The Book of the Watchers, like the other parts of the corpus, is itself a composite of earlier traditions that have been brought together into what VanderKam describes as "a passable literary unity."[23] Even the different sections of the book as we shall outline them below show some evidence of drawing together previously independent units or stories, a fact that seems especially clear in the ʿAśaʾel/Šemîḥazah traditions.[24]

The book is generally seen as comprising 5 main sections: an introduction (1–5); the stories of the angels' sin (6–11); the interaction of Enoch with the Watchers and Enoch's commissioning by God (12–16); Enoch's first journey (17–19); Enoch's second journey (20–36). It is possible that we should also take chapter 82 as part of the book, although it is perhaps

[23] J.C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16, (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984), 110. VanderKam cites Dimant ("The 'Fallen Angels' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them," Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1974) who describes the work as a *catalog* (page 22).

[24] See Carol A. Newsom "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgement." *CBQ 42* (1980), 313–14.

best regarded as a bridging narrative with either the Dream Visions or the Epistle.[25] Even in this composite form, the Book of Watchers may be conservatively dated to around 170 B.C.E., and probably earlier.[26]

Future Elements in the Eschatology of the Book of Watchers

It is clear almost immediately that the Book of the Watchers is oriented towards a future event: the judgement of God upon the Watchers and upon humanity. In the introduction (chapters 1–5), the first part of Enoch's discourse (1:3c–9) consists of a theophany depicting God as "The Great Holy One"[27] coming forth from his dwelling to tread upon Mount Sinai in judgement,[28] a judgement that will clearly have global significance:

> The earth will be wholly rent asunder,
> and everything on earth will perish,
> and there will be judgement on all. (1:7)[29]

This theophany is then followed by a denouncement speech (2:1–5:4)[30] in which the faithfulness of the created order is contrasted with the faithlessness of those who "have turned aside."[31] This speech leads up to a resumption of the promise of judgement in 5:5–7.[32]

This emphasis on a future judgement is not an alien intrusion upon the substance of the Book of the Watchers as a whole, merely tagged on in the introduction;[33] rather it reflects the very structure of the rest of the narrative as it now stands. Following the story of the Watchers'

---

[25] See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 334–335, 337–338 and Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 21–22.

[26] See the discussion in VanderKam, *Enoch and the…Apocalyptic Tradition*, 111–114.

[27] This is one of the distinctive divine epithets in the corpus. For a discussion, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 144. Argall's discussion of this whole section as reflecting the form of a Divine Warrior hymn should also be noted (*1 Enoch and Sirach*, 167–174).

[28] I shall discuss the location of this theophany—Mount Sinai—below.

[29] Translation: Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 142.

[30] For this classification, see Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (ConBNT 12. Lund: Gleerup, 1979), 49.

[31] The phrase as preserved in 4QEn[a] is ואנתן שניתן עבדכן "but you, you have changed your works." See Milik, *Enoch*, 146 and 149.

[32] Rau ("Kosmologie, Eschatology und die Lehrautorität Henochs: Traditions- und Formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum äthiopischen Henochbuch und zu verwandten Schriften," Diss, University of Hamburg, 1974, 106–24. Cited by Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 101) argues that this combination reflects the late prophetic form of the "salvation-judgement oracle." See also Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 49.

[33] The introduction is probably the latest redactional addition to the work.

descent in chapters 6–11, which itself builds towards its climax with the binding of the Watchers and the pronouncement of judgement upon them,[34] Enoch is requested to bring a petition before God on behalf of the Watchers (12:1–13:7).[35] His throne vision in chapter 14 culminates in a divine message of denunciation upon the Watchers in chapters 15 and 16 that itself culminates with the promise, "You will have no peace" (16:4). Enoch is then led on the first of two journeys.[36] His cosmological visions culminate in his vision of the great chasm at the edge of the world that serves as a prison for the rebel Watchers (18:10–11, 19:1) and of the desolate place in which the rebel stars are bound (18:12–16).[37] While the cosmological visions cannot be reduced to an eschatological function,[38] this *direction* of the narrative does seem to stress that the other functions of the visions have been subsumed under the eschatological one. On the second of his two journeys, Enoch moves in reverse; now his vision is expanded to include not only the prisons for the Watchers and the stars (21) but also those of human sinners (22:10,13). This dimension is brought to its climax in chapter 26:1–27:5 with Enoch's vision of the site of Jerusalem where he sees the "cursed valley" (of Hinnom),[39] where the godless will be cast at the time of the "righteous judgement" (27:2–3).[40]

---

[34] Note the motif of the accusation or cry of the earth going up to heaven in 7:6 and 8:4 followed by the Archangels bringing accusation against the Watchers to God in chapter 9. (There is possibly an accusation against God himself in 9:11). Chapter 10 then commissions the binding of the Watchers, an event which gives way in verse 16 to the command for Michael to destroy iniquity from the face of the earth, looking forward to the final judgement.

[35] This part of the narrative begins with Enoch being sent to the Watchers with a message of doom.

[36] Glasson has suggested that this journey is modelled upon Greek *Nekyia* journeys. See, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology: With Special Reference to Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs* (London: SPCK, 1961), 8–11. Newson has suggested a different model in "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgement." *CBQ 42* (1980), 310–329. Her suggestion is that the journey should be likened to the ancient Near Eastern practice of displaying the wealth of one's kingdom to visiting diplomats. Nickelsburg prefers the former suggestion (*1 Enoch*, 280)

[37] For the significance of the stars, see Nickelsburg , *1 Enoch*, 288–289.

[38] For these non-eschatological functions, see Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 116–118.

[39] See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 319.

[40] Note M.T. Wacker, *Weltordnung und Gericht: Studien zu 1 Henoch 22* (FB 45, Würzburg: Echter, 1982), 243–244, who sees "two-ways" imagery in the contrast of the cursed valley and the blessed place of the holy mountain (26:1–2), paralleling it with Psalm 1:3 and Jer 17:5–8.

It is clear that the judgement in view is a final one.[41] That this is the case emerges from some of the terminology employed. It is for "the day of the great judgement" that the Watchers have been imprisoned (10:6), when the "eternal judgement is consummated" (10:12).[42] The destruction language used in 1:9 and 10:14,15,16 is also significant. Such language, however, merely makes explicit the finality implied by the storyline. Aside from one brief reference to Adam and Eve in 32:6, the Book of Watchers depicts the problem of sin (including human sin) as a consequence of the descent of the Watchers. The imprisonment and eventual destruction of those Watchers, together with the humans who allied themselves with them, therefore indicates a final end to all that is wrong in the world. Against such a background, the reference to the destruction of all iniquity in 10:16 makes perfect sense.

As a natural corollary of the destruction of all iniquity, there is also a stress on the restoration or renovation of the pristine state of creation. Hints of this begin to emerge in the contrast between the chosen and the sinners in 5:5–9: the former will "inherit the earth" (5:6–7) from which iniquity has been cast; they enjoy peace in an earth no longer covered by violence (5:9). This last point connects with the emphasis, seen particularly in chapter 9, that iniquity has come "upon the earth" (9:1,6,8,9,10) and is particularly seen in acts of violence: "All the earth was full of the godlessness and the violence that had befallen it" (9:1).

The idea of the restoration of creation is found particularly in 10:16–11:2, a passage reminiscent of Isaiah 65:17–25 in its portrayal of a world free of trouble and full of life and bounty. The passage is part of the address to Michael that began in 10:11. As such, it is technically set in the *Urzeit*. However, it is clear that the primeval imagery is intended as typological for eschatology. As Nickelsburg notes, "In its eschatological dimension, this aspect of the story promises a new start beyond the destruction wreaked by the great judgement."[43] That such an eschatological interpretation is required is indicated by two things. First, the imagery is so utopian that it cannot simply refer to the post-Flood humanity except by way of type: *all* the earth (10:22) is cleansed

[41] The reference to Noah and the flood in 10:1–3 seems to function as a type for the later descriptions of judgement in chapter 10, which cannot simply refer to the flood and the post-flood world. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 219–228 and Hartman "An Early Example of Jewish Exegesis: *1 Enoch* 10:16–11:2," *Neot* 17 (1983), 20–22.

[42] These phrases are not preserved in the Aramaic fragments. 4QEn^{b} however precedes the latter phrase with a reference to "the great day," יומא רבא.

[43] *1 Enoch 1*, 219.

of *all* perversity and iniquity (10:16, 20, 22), *all* the sons of men become righteous (10:21), truth and peace will be united for *all* the generations of men (11:2). The fact that such language occurs in the context of primeval events that clearly have not led to such a utopian state, requires that the function of such language here is eschatological.[44] Secondly, the reference to "the plant of righteousness," as a conduit of blessing in 10:16 indicates eschatological associations. This term will be discussed below, where it will be noted that it is commonly used to denote an eschatological remnant[45] in Jewish texts. At this point, it is sufficient to note that the use of such a term creates immediate eschatological associations in this story, associations that are confirmed in the mind of the reader by the character of the new world order described.

Also interesting, as we consider the idea of restored creation, are the references to the tree of life and the tree of wisdom, in 24:4–25:6 and 32:3–6 respectively. Both have their background in the Fall story of Genesis 2–3.[46] Only the tree of life, however, is depicted as having eschatological significance: after the Great Judgement it will "be given to the righteous and pious" (25:4) and "will be transplanted to the holy place, by the house of God" (25:5). What was lost to Adam and Eve when they were driven from the garden, then, is restored to the righteous after the judgement.

By contrast, the tree of wisdom is not restored to the righteous. Enoch himself, it is stressed, only sees it "from afar" (32:3), yet the "holy ones"

---

[44] For this point, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 167, where he speaks of the "radical incompatibility" of the descriptions found in 10:16–11:2 with the post-flood world. The key to this running together of *primordial* and *eschatological* appears to lie in this concept of a remnant that is delivered from the primordial/final judgements. In other words, there appears to be a typology in operation.

[45] I will use the term "remnant" frequently in what follows to denote a group that is distinguished from the mainstream of Judaism (if we can speak of such a thing). I am aware that this may not correspond with the way that the term is used in some biblical literature and that my usage is, on this level, somewhat vague. It is useful, however, to have a shorthand term denoting a group distinguished from its parent group on the basis of a self-perception that it represents the true group. For the biblical development of the term remnant, see Gerhard F. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah* (Andrews University Monographs, Studies in Religion 5; Berrien Springs, Mich: Andrews University Press, 1974); also Paul Edward Dinter, "The Remnant of Israel and the Stone of Stumbling in Zion According to Paul (Romans 9–11)," (Ph.D. Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1980), 160–239.

[46] See especially 28:6 "This is the tree of wisdom from which your father of old and your mother of old, who were before you, ate . . . and they were driven from the garden." (trans. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 320).

(angels)[47] eat from it and learn "great wisdom." This point is of major importance for, as shall be seen below, those same angels mediate wisdom to Enoch, who then mediates it to humanity. Insofar as this element is eschatological, it is realised, not future.

Realised Elements in the Eschatology of the Book of the Watchers

Clearly, the Book of the Watchers is oriented towards this great, future event of the day of judgement. But a case can be made that the book regards that judgement to be imminent and regards the events leading up to that judgement to have been set in motion or inaugurated. In order to see that this is the case, we need to understand what the book does with the concept of revealed wisdom.

The theme of wisdom being revealed to Enoch and then transmitted to others is as central a theme to the book as is that of judgement. Within the body of the narrative, we are first introduced to Enoch as a "righteous scribe," (12:3–4)[48] a title which suggests Enoch's function as the one who will write something down for the purpose of transmission. Chapters 14–16 describe his ascent to heaven, throne vision and commissioning as a prophet.[49] Here he is addressed as a "righteous man, a scribe of truth" (15:1). Following this commission, Enoch is led on his two journeys. At the climax of the first journey, Enoch's uniqueness as a recipient of revelation is stressed.[50] As the second journey nears its climax, another important element arises from Enoch's viewing of the garden of paradise containing the tree of wisdom (32:3), a tree that he himself sees only from afar,[51] unlike the angels, who eat from the tree and "learn great wisdom." The narrative establishes a contrast between Adam and Eve, who ate from the tree and learned wisdom, an act that results in their being driven from the garden (33:6), and Enoch, who receives his wisdom via the angels who have learned wisdom from the

[47] On the terminology of "Holy Ones," see Nickelsburg's excursus in *1 Enoch 1*, 140–1. Also, L. Dequecker, "The 'Saints of the Most High' in Qumran and Daniel," *OTS* 18 (1973), 108–87.

[48] For a discussion of the translation of "righteous" see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 270 (also for the connection with 15:1 discussed below). For the priestly and prophetic connotations of the title "scribe," see Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 26–28.

[49] For a discussion of this prophetic commissioning, see Argall, ibid., 29–30, and Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 9–20.

[50] 19:3: "I, Enoch, alone saw the visions, the extremities of all things. And no one among humans has seen as I saw." Translation, Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 276.

[51] Greek: μακρόθεν; Ethiopic: *kaḥaktihomu.*

tree. If 81:1–82:4 belong to the Book of the Watchers (they certainly presuppose it), then this wisdom received by Enoch through his visions from God and the seven guiding angels (20:1–8) is the same wisdom that is then written down (82:1) and transmitted to, and through, Methuselah (82:1–3).

That this revealed wisdom has a salvific function emerges when it is viewed against the background of the story of the Watchers, and particularly that of ʿAśaʾel. The divinely authorised wisdom given to Enoch stands in sharp contrast to the "worthless mystery" revealed by ʿAśaʾel.[52] In the introduction to the book (see especially 5:8), the chosen "sin no more" after they are given this wisdom and, as a result of this, they also escape God's wrath (5:9). Thus, the narrative of the Book of the Watchers deals with the problem of sin in two ways: with the promise of the destruction of that sin, and with the promise of salvific wisdom to lead the chosen out of it. As Nickelsburg comments:

> This dualistic counterposing of truth and its perversion is essential to the Enochic myth and to the description of the end time explicit or implicit in several layers of the tradition.[53]

It is the connection of Enoch's wisdom with a group designated "the chosen" in the introduction that brings to the fore the idea that the eschatology of the book is inaugurated. In the superscription to the book (1:1), Enoch blesses the "righteous chosen"[54] who will be present on the "day of tribulation."[55] Moving into the body of the introduction, Enoch takes up his "discourse,"[56] pronouncing that it is not for this generation but for "a far-off generation"[57] that he speaks. In the parallel phrase at the beginning of verse 3 this far-off generation is designated "the chosen."

---

[52] 16:3 "Worthless" translates Ethiopic *mennuna.* Newsom's article, "Development of *1 Enoch* 6–19," suggests that the ʿAśaʾel material was added to function as a literary foil to the tradition that saw Enoch as the revealer of the true mystery.

[53] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 27.

[54] Translating ἐκλεκτοὺς δικαίους. Ethiopic is *ḫeruyāna waṣādeqāna* "chosen and righteous ones."

[55] Greek: εἰς ἡμέραν ἀνάγκης. The Hebrew phrase יום צרה occurs in the Hebrew Bible (2 Kings 19:3, Ps 50:15, 77:3, Obadiah 12, 14). A similar phrase, "time of distress/tribulation" עת־צרה occurs in Daniel 12:1. This passage depicts a group being delivered from this distress as they are led to righteousness by "the wise" המשכלים. It also speaks of Daniel's scroll being sealed up "until the time of the end" עד־עת קץ.

[56] The Greek here is. τὴν παραβολὴν αὐτοῦ. Milik notes that the singular seems to have been used to translate the plural form מתלות]י ("his parables") in imitation of Numbers 23:7 (*Enoch*, 89). For the parallels between this section and the Balaam oracles, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 138.

[57] 4QEn[a] 1i preserves חיק]לד[ר.

The parallels between this section and the Balaam oracles of Numbers 23–24 throw one specific contrast into sharp relief: Balaam's blessings were upon Israel,[58] Enoch's blessings are upon the chosen. This same movement of substituting the language of "the chosen" for the language of "Israel" is seen in 1:8, which Hartman has demonstrated to be an elaboration of the elements of the Aaronic blessing of Numbers 6:24–26.[59] The inference, then, is that there will be a specific group, which may not be simply identified as Israel, which will only come into existence in the distant future (with respect to Enoch). An interesting development of this is found in 10:3 where the remnant of humanity delivered from the flood is referred to as a "plant,"[60] language that is reprised in 10:16 in the phrase "let the plant of righteousness appear,"[61] where the reference cannot be to the remnant that escaped the flood, and instead appears to be a remnant escaping the final judgement.[62]

Two features would suggest that the distant future in which this group comes into existence is that of the end-time itself. First, the references to the blessings of the chosen above bracket the description of God's appearing in judgement (1:3b–7c). This juxtaposing is of particular significance in the case of verse 8, where the description of God making peace with the righteous and protecting the chosen seems to stand in deliberate contrast to verse 7, with its pronouncement of judgement upon all and the perishing of everything upon the earth. The chosen are thus presented as a group delivered from, or exempted from, the judgement. *1 Enoch* 5:5 functions as a foil to 1:8; it takes up the same vocabulary but, in speaking of the fate of sinners, negates it. They will not receive blessing but, rather, "an eternal curse"; for them there will be "no mercy or peace." This antithesis is continued into verses 6 and 7, in which, in comparison to each of the blessings pronounced upon the righteous, a curse is pronounced upon the sinners. This juxtaposing of the references to the chosen to the descriptions of judgement

---

[58] Num 23: 7,21,23; 24:5,17,18.

[59] Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 5, 32–38, 44–48, 132–136.

[60] The reading here "from him will be planted a plant" is not supported by the Ethiopic or by all of the Greek manuscripts. It occurs in the Chronography of George Syncellus which Milik takes to be the most reliable text at this point. See Milik, *Enoch*, 162.

[61] "Plant of righteousness" is attested by 4QEn^{c} 1v: צבת קושטא[נ.

[62] For further discussions of the "plant" imagery and its connection with a remnant theology, see Patrick A. Tiller, "The Eternal Planting in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997), 312–35; Shozo Fujita, "The Metaphor of the Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (1976), 30–45. Note also how the imagery is used in Isaiah 61:3.

establishes a close connection between the two that, when combined with the superscription's reference to the righteous chosen who will be present on the day of tribulation and with the reference in 1:3 to a distant generation, strongly implies that the chosen belong to a group that comes into existence at the end time.

Second, the giving of wisdom to the chosen in *1 Enoch* 5:8 appears to be the act that brings about their eschatological blessing: through receiving wisdom, they receive life and are delivered from sinfulness. While it is difficult to establish the chronological relationship of this giving of wisdom in relation to the time of the judgement,[63] the logic of verses 8–9 is that the chosen, who have been led out of their transgressions, will not die in the heat of God's wrath but "the number of their days they will complete" (5:9b). This may well suggest that the receiving of wisdom takes place within a lifetime of the judgement. Nickelsburg's comments, while referring to the whole Enochic corpus, may be appropriately cited here in reference to the Book of the Watchers:

> Thus the books of Enoch are a corpus of texts that guarantee future salvation on the basis of a present reality to which the seer had been privy and which he then revealed. That seer—in the book's fiction, Enoch of old; in reality the complement of authors who stand behind these texts—provides a bridge between opposing worlds, present and future, earthly and cosmic, human and divine. His revelations, written down, transmitted and interpreted, constitute and regulate the community of the chosen and righteous. Although allegedly received in primordial antiquity, these revelations are promulgated in a present that stands on the threshhold of the end time. Functionally, they are eschatological revelation . . . Definitive deliverance will take place soon.[64]

It is reasonable to suggest that the community that transmitted the Book of the Watchers perceived itself to be that chosen remnant, a suggestion that would be supported if Nickelsburg and Suter are correct in seeing the story of the Watchers as partly symbolic of the perceived corruption

---

[63] The positioning of verse 8 after verse 7 may be taken as suggesting that the giving of wisdom occurs after the judgement, but this would seem to contradict the flow of verses 8 and 9, discussed below. It is probably better to see this as a parallel unit to verse 6 and 7, with verse 8 demonstrating why the chosen receive "forgiveness . . . mercy, peace and clemency" (because they have been delivered from their godlessness and pride, verse 8) and expanding on the nature of the "good light" that constitutes the salvation of the chosen (verse 8: "in the enlightened man there will be light, and in the wise man, understanding." Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 159).

[64] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 42.

of the Temple.[65] The community would then be those who perceived themselves as having received a wisdom that has set them apart from the corrupt body. This suggestion may receive further support from Hartman's suggestion that the use of tenses in *1 Enoch* 1–5 is intended to "make the reader interpret his own time in a very specific way."[66]

The Dream Visions

Having established the nature of the eschatology that underlies the Book of the Watchers, it seems wise to limit the discussion of the Dream Visions and the Epistle of Enoch to noting some similarities that suggest that these parts of the corpus share the eschatological outlook of that book.

There are two dream visions recounted in chapters 83–90. The first of those visions draws upon and expands the chosen minority/remnant typology that we noted earlier in our discussion of chapters 10–11: Enoch prays, in obedience to his grandfather, that God would preserve a remnant of humanity from the coming destruction (83:8). This remnant is again referred to as a plant (84:6), and again, despite the antediluvian setting, there seems to be a running together of primordial and eschatological elements, as reflected by the references to the "great day of judgement" (84:4) and "eternal destruction" (84:5).

The second of the two visions is the Animal Vision of chapters 85–90. The main point of note with regard to this Vision is that in its final form, as represented in the Enochic corpus, a major turning point comes with the birth of the lambs in 90:6–7, whose eyes are opened. This event is followed by a time of oppression for those lambs, but nevertheless leads very quickly to the judgement described in verses 19–27. Again, a typology appears to be at work, this time between the lambs whose eyes are opened—who are eventually delivered by the intervention of the great judgement—and those living in the time of Moses (89:28) and Samuel (89:41), whose eyes are opened temporarily. There seems again, therefore, to be present here the idea that the revealing of wisdom, here denoted by the opening of eyes, is an eschatological event, prefigured in the times of Moses and Samuel and connected to an imminent

[65] Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981), 575–600; D.W. Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in *1 Enoch*." *HUCA* 50 (1979), 115–135.

[66] Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 16. His argument is based in the distinct use of tenses for accusations, curses, reflections and promises.

judgement. Only the inclusion of this vision in the Enochic corpus would lead the reader to connect this wisdom with that of Enoch.

Once again, it is a striking corollary of the judgement and destruction of sin that the original pristine state of creation is restored. In 85:3, at the beginning of the Animal Apocalypse, the original man is depicted as a white bull, in contrast to the black bull of Cain and his line. In the degeneration of history that ensues, the symbol of the white bull continues to be used of those who are righteous (85:9; 89:1,9,11) until it is used of Noah in 89:9. From this point on, the imagery of sheep is used of Israel: the glory of the white bull has disappeared from the earth. But in the *eschaton*, after sin is judged and destroyed (90:24–27), a white bull is once again born; not only so, but as the seer watches, the leaders of all the wild animals, described earlier as attacking the sheep and lambs of God's flock (90:2–4,8–9), are transformed into white cattle (90:37). As Nickelsburg notes, the birth of the white bull probably representing a Messianic figure after the judgement "catalyzes the transformation of all the species into white bulls, the one species from which all of them came."[67] The point is clear: with the corruption of sin no longer tainting the earth, the pristine state of creation may be recapitulated.

The Epistle of Enoch

That the Epistle of Enoch presumes the content of the Book of the Watchers at many points has been demonstrated by Nickelsburg.[68] From this, we would expect that the eschatology of the earlier book would be reflected by the Epistle and numerous passages reflect that this is so. The reference to "the righteous one" who will "arise from sleep" in the introduction to the Epistle (92:3) may well reflect an eschatological giving of wisdom, a possibility supported by the parallel phrase that he will "walk in paths of righteousness." Again, this event is closely linked to the judgement (92:5)[69] in which Enoch himself, as the great scribe, may play a significant role.[70] The two-ways instruction in 94:1–5 probably reflects the same idea:

---

[67] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 407.

[68] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 422–23.

[69] Again, note the reference to the "last generations" in 92:1. VanderKam (*Enoch and the Growth*, 173) describes Enoch as he is depicted in the Epistle as "a sage who teaches the last generations the way of righteousness in critical times and exhorts his community to patient hope in the final hours of the world."

[70] See the discussion of 92:1 in VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 173–174.

> To certain men of a generation the paths of violence and death will be revealed;
> and they will keep away from them,
> and they will not follow them.[71]

The beatitude in 98:10 also reflects the conviction that it is the possession of wisdom that leads to salvation.

The theme of future judgement is again central to the Epistle, emerging particularly in the woe forms that make up so much of the book.[72] While eternal judgement (as opposed to simply misfortune in this life) is implied in many of the individual woes, certain collections of woe-oracles are juxtaposed with descriptions of the judgement (97:3–10; 98:9–99:5; 99:11–100:4), making this emphasis even more explicit. Yet this future judgement is not seen as a distant thing; the use of the adverb "quickly"[73] in 94:1,6,7; 95:6; 96:1,6; 97:10; 98:16 in connection with verbs of destruction suggests that it is imminent. Again, therefore, the material suggests that its readers are to see themselves as a community living in the last days, saved from the coming wrath by the wisdom that has been revealed to them.

Again, the idea of restored creation parallels that of judgement. As iniquity is cast from the earth, the righteous are given healing and hear a voice of rest from heaven (96:3). From the time of judgement, the righteous will sleep peacefully, unthreatened by evil (100:5). While not as developed as the theme within the Book of the Watchers, some notion of the restoration of creation is implied in such language.

The Apocalypse of Weeks

The Apocalypse of Weeks is widely taken to be an older composition that has been inserted into the body of the Epistle of Enoch,[74] although García Martínez has argued against this view and his arguments have been further developed by Boccaccini.[75] As we shall notice below, it also sees the giving of wisdom to the chosen as an eschatological event, and this may be the main reason for its inclusion in the Enochic corpus.

---

[71] Translation: Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 454.

[72] See for instance 94:6–95:2, 95:4–7, 96:4–8, 97:7–10, 98:9–99:2, 99:11–16.

[73] Greek: ταχέως/ταχὺ, Ethiopic *fetuna.*

[74] See the discussion of the origin and date of the Apocalypse of Weeks in VanderKam, *Enoch and the…Apocalyptic Tradition*, 142–149.

[75] F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 79–94; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 104–9.

It warrants greater discussion at this stage in our study than does the rest of the Epistle because of its schematization of history and what that might reveal to us of how soon the judgement was expected to come.

Future Elements in the Eschatology of the Apocalypse of Weeks

The Apocalypse of Weeks schematises history into ten weeks. The schema builds towards the description of the time of judgement in the final three weeks (91:11–17). Again, a flood-typology appears with the use of the Flood as a paradigm for the final judgement.[76] This typology appears to be used in order to undergird the notion of a "remnant" who will be faithful and be delivered from the final judgement even as such a group was delivered from the Flood.[77] The finality of the judgement to come is reflected in the language used in 91:15 of "the Great Judgment."[78] That judgment will involve both destruction of sinners and the cosmic upheaval that will result in the removal or destruction of sin:

> And all the deeds of wickedness will vanish from the whole earth and descend to the eternal pit (91:14).[79]

In contrast to this is striking use of the motif of "eternity" for the blessings awaiting the righteous: "generations of eternity", דרי עלמין, in 91:13; "the path of eternal righteousness", קשט עלמא, in 91:14; "eternal judgment" and "eternal heaven" in 91:15 and "all the powers of the heavens will shine forever" in 91:16.[80] If we compare this language to that used of the Flood (93:4–5), which as we have noticed functions as

---

[76] See 93:4, where the Flood is described as "the first end."

[77] See especially *1 Enoch* 83:8; 84:5–6, speaking of the remnant escaping the flood, and compare to 90: 28–32 speaking of the remnant escaping the final judgement.

[78] This verse, as a whole, is rather difficult to reconstruct from the different manuscripts, which vary widely in their witness. The Aramaic of 4QEn^{g} 1 iv, however, seems to support the rendering "the fixed time (קץ) of the Great Judgement (דינא רבא)." It should be pointed out, however, that רבא is broken after the *bet* and is not so clear as either Milik (*Enoch*, 266–269) or Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 437) would suggest. Nevertheless, it remains the most obvious reading.

[79] Nickelsburg, *op cit.* 434. Milik, *Books of Enoch, 266–267*, here prefers the translation "doers of wickedness." The Ethiopic is *kwellu tagbār rasi'ān*, which would favour the translation "deeds" and there is a lacuna in the Aramaic fragment (4QEn^{g} 1 4:20) at this point which only allows us to read [ ]עב with any certainty. The Ethiopic may well, therefore, attest the original form.

[80] The text of this line is rather uncertain: the Ethiopic and Aramaic differ as to whether the verb is "rise" or "shine". The emphasis on eternity is found in both, however (Aramaic: [ן]לבול עמי, 4QEn^{g} 1 4:25).

an antitype, the finality of the last judgment, and of the state of affairs that will follow it, emerge in sharp contrast.

Realised Elements in the Eschatology of the Apocalypse of Weeks

While the ten week schema of the Apocalypse of Weeks moves towards the final judgement, it may also be argued that it presents the end time as inaugurated. Again, the key to this is the theme of the revealing of wisdom, which here takes place in the seventh week:

> And at its conclusion (the seventh week), the chosen will be chosen,
> as witnesses of righteousness from the eternal plant of righteousness,
> to whom will be given sevenfold wisdom and knowledge (93:10)[81]

As the appendix to the Apocalypse of Weeks (93:11–14) implies, the core of this salvific wisdom is the revelation given through Enoch himself.[82] VanderKam has convincingly demonstrated that the "seventh week"—in which the awakening takes place—depicts the time of composition of the Apocalypse of Weeks.[83] This would mean that the authors' intended audience are the people of their own day, a group whom they describe as having been given wisdom. A similar case can be made in the Animal Vision; there, the historical allusions are quite clear until just after the eyes of the lambs are opened, when events move towards the eschatological judgement (90:6–19). This would suggest that the religious awakening is understood to have taken place recently (or to be in the process of taking place now: note, the lambs "began" to see).

Having located this awakening in the time of the books' composition, or in their recent past, we may now ask where the event occurs in relation to the *eschaton*. We have noted already that in the Animal Vision, the opening of the lambs' eyes signals a shift, with historical allegory now

---

[81] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 434. The imagery establishes a clear parallel with 93:10, which speaks of Abraham.

[82] The placing of these verses, which contain a series of rhetorical questions that all would be answerable by "Enoch," is a problem. For this, and for information generally about the order of chapters 91–93, see the classic discussions in François Martin, *Le Livre d'Hénoch: Documents pour l'Étude de la Bible, Traduit sur le Texte Éthiopien*, Paris: Letouzey et Ané 1906, 245 and R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text, and edited with the introduction notes and indexes of the first edition wholly recast, enlarged and rewritten; together with a reprint from the editor's text of the Greek fragments*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1912, 231. For the significance of the questions as pointing to the special status of Enoch's visions, see Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 112.

[83] James C. VanderKam, "Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (I Enoch 93:1–10, 91:11–17)," *CBQ* 46 (1984) 521–523.

giving way to eschatological events. Thus, the awakening of the lambs would appear to be the inaugural eschatological event. A similar point emerges in the Apocalypse of Weeks. The seventh week, structurally, is the turning-point of the work, a fact that emerges in a number of ways. First, the events prior to the seventh week (93:4–9) have clear historical referents, while those following it (91:11–17) express general eschatological hopes. Second, weeks eight to ten may be demonstrated to be dependent upon the earlier weeks. Specifically, there is no description of the wickedness that is being judged in those latter weeks; this information must be derived from the earlier weeks. Also, week eight forms a natural pair with week seven, as the judgement announced in the former week is finally executed (93:10, 91:11–12). Third, week seven heralds the shift from the time when wickedness prevails into the three weeks when it is destroyed. Thus, again, it would appear to be the first event in the eschatological calendar.[84] A further important link between the group of the seventh week and those who will enjoy the eschatological reversal is established by the terminology of "righteous/righteousness." This terminology occurs throughout the apocalypse to refer to the faithful and chosen, but only sporadically, since the history of the people alternates between fidelity and straying. In 93:10 it takes on fresh significance as a *permanent* characteristic of the chosen (93:10). The terminology then recurs seven times in 91:12–17, establishing a link between the utopian future state and the present group of the chosen.

One final question suggests itself here. What, if anything, is said about the length of time between the inauguration and the consummation of the eschatological calendar? Here there is little agreement among scholars. In discussing the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, Hartman sees the events of the final judgement as imminent, since otherwise they would provide little comfort to the righteous.[85] Against this, both Doeve and Koch argue that the period of the final three weeks is equal in length to the preceding three weeks, and therefore equal to the length of time from the Exodus to the giving of wisdom.[86] Koch's argument, in partic-

---

[84] Although less obvious, Hartman has seen a similar element arising in chapters 1–5. His argument is based in the distinct use of tenses for accusations, curses, reflections and promises. He concludes from this that "the Introduction may make the reader interpret his own time in a very specific way." Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 16. We may also note here the two groups addressees of Enoch in 92:1: his sons and "the last generation."

[85] Lars Hartman, "The Function of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables," *NTS* 22 (1975–1976) 11–13.

[86] J.W. Doeve, "Parousieverzögerung" *Ned TT* 17 (1962–1963) 33–36. Klaus Koch, "Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte: Die sogenannte Zehn-Wochen-Apocalypse (1 Hen

ular, is impressive in the material it handles and in its attempt to locate the time of the composition of the *Apocalypse*. Nickelsburg follows Koch in seeing the final consummation as located in the distant future.[87] It is important to stress, however, that the remoteness of the final consummation does not lessen the significance of the fact that the corpus does present this eschatological time as having been inaugurated.

Eschatology in the Enochic Testamentary Collection: Conclusions

The chapter thus far has demonstrated that the eschatology of *1 Enoch*, at least of the books that we have studied thus far, is neither entirely futurist nor entirely realised; rather it is an *inaugurated* eschatology. Such an eschatology appears to be present in each of the three core units that make up the "testament" that Nickelsburg argued was attested by the Aramaic fragments. What is striking about this eschatology is that the point of inauguration is located in the revealing of wisdom to a remnant group, or in the opening of their eyes. The wisdom revealed appears to be that contained within the books of Enoch, so that possession of those books takes on an eschatological significance. In addition, the idea that the creation will be restored to a pristine state after the destruction of sin has also been isolated as a major feature of this eschatology, though unlike the possession of revealed wisdom, this element seems to belong to the future.

Excursus: 1 Enoch *and the Mosaic Torah*

The question of the relationship between *1 Enoch* and the Mosaic Torah is a matter of some debate. On one side of this debate, Hartman[88] and Sanders[89] have seen a positive connection between the two; on the other side, Sacchi[90] and, rather more cautiously, Nickelsburg[91] have seen the

---

93:1–10; 91:11–17) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum," *ZNW 95* (1983) 403–430. A further argument for a long period of time between inauguration and consummation of the eschatological period is found in Richard Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 320–326. Bauckham argues that each of the weeks is a period of seven generations, and suggests that within this schema, the eschatological period is fulfilled in 3 stages, each also made up of seven generations.

[87] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 440.

[88] Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*.

[89] E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).

[90] Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. W.J. Short, JSPSup20, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1997).

[91] See especially Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 50. See also idem, "Enochic Wisdom: An

relationship as being more negative.[92] Boccaccini's recent work[93] has attempted a more thorough study of this, noting the developments of the relationship that are seen in the developing Enochic corpus. Andreas Bedenbender has also examined the development of the relationship, arguing for a rapprochement over time between Enochic and Mosaic traditions.[94]

It is certainly the case that there is little direct mention made of the Mosaic Torah; only 93:6 and possibly 99:2 make any explicit reference to that covenant.[95] The Animal Apocalypse devotes a significant portion of its narrative to the Sinai theophany (89:29–35), but makes no explicit mention of the giving of the Torah, a significant silence in the eyes of Nickelsburg.[96] However, while these are the only direct references, the work as a whole, and notably the Introduction (1–5) can be seen to display frequent allusions to the Torah. Hartman[97] traces many of these, although his case is weakened somewhat by his overuse of rabbinic sources to demonstrate parallels. In particular, the location of the theophany, described in the opening chapter as taking place on Sinai, may be seen to be of significance; Bauckham suggests that these chapters "evoke God's covenant with Israel as their 'referential background.'"[98] In addition, there is the crucial fact that the Enochic corpus nowhere contains a body of laws comparable to that of the Torah, despite assuming high ethical standards, echoed in the terminology of "righteousness." Connected to this, there is an emphasis throughout the corpus that one

---

Alternative to Mosaic Torah?" in *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*, Edited by Jodi Magness and Seymour Gittin (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 123–132.

[92] The notion of the Enochic corpus forming an alternative Pentateuch, developed by G.H. Dix, "The Enochic Pentateuch," *JTS* 27 (1925–1926) 29–42, and then by Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 58, 77–78, 183–184, has been refuted by Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977) 51–65.

[93] Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis.*

[94] A. Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der Frühjüdischen Apokalyptik* (ANTZ 8; Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000).

[95] Boccaccini sees 93:6 as evidence of a shift in attitude towards the Torah in later Enochic circles. See ibid., 107.

[96] See, *1 Enoch 1*, 379–80.

[97] Lars Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (ConBNT 12. Lund: Gleerup, 1979).

[98] R.J. Bauckham, "Apocalypses," in D.A Carson *et al.*, *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 1. The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (WUNT 2: 140; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 142.

of the characteristics of the wicked is "straying",[99] which would seem to assume something to be strayed from. Indeed, this is the very point of the cosmological observations in 2:1–5:3: they contrast the faithfulness of the heavenly bodies with the straying of the wicked.

Still, the fact remains that it is Enoch, not Moses, who receives the revelation that is crucial to salvation and, at the very least, there is an indication in the texts of an insufficiency or inadequacy in Torah. Torah is no longer sufficient for salvation; one must also be in possession of the revealed wisdom contained in Enoch's books.

What precisely constitutes such inadequacy? The Animal Apocalypse suggests that the inability to sustain faithfulness may be a starting point, since the post-Sinai history of Israel is one of constant fluctuation between faithfulness and apostasy (cf. 89:41; "Sometimes their eyes were opened, and sometimes they were blinded"). The eschatological insights throughout the Enochic writings may serve a role in this regard, motivating right behaviour on the basis of future consequences. But also important are a proper understanding of the origin of sin (arising as a consequence of the descent of the Watchers), and revealed cosmological details which are of halakhic importance (in determining feasts, et cetera). Thus, even if *1 Enoch* does not regard Torah negatively, it still implies that the latter must be interpreted in the light of Enoch's visions. Small wonder then that it is the reception of Enochic wisdom, and not Torah, that lies at the root of ethics in the Epistle of Enoch (cf. 103:2).

It is important to notice, in this connection, the changes that 1:8 makes to the Aaronic blessing: it is no longer the children of Israel that are blessed but, "the chosen and righteous." This redefinition we have already noted as taking place also in 93:10, which redefines the "eternal planting of righteousness" mentioned in 93:5 to indicate not Israel *per se*, but the chosen remnant. Thus, the inaugurated eschatology of *1 Enoch*, which includes the formation of a group designated "the chosen," functions to delineate that group from the rest of Judaism. The crucial marker of that group is their possession of, and allegiance to, the revealed wisdom that has come through Enoch.

[99] See 93:9, 98:15–99:2; 100:9. See also Nickelsburg's excursus on "Those Who Lead Many Astray" in *1 Enoch 1*, 486–488.

Part 2: Form, Ethics and Eschatology in the Enochic Testamentary Collection

This chapter now turns to examine the paraenetic material in *1 Enoch*, with a view to establishing the effect that the characteristic eschatology has had on the ethical teaching of the texts and on the forms used to teach such ethics. The core thesis that I will explore in the remainder of this chapter is that the centrality of the concept of "wisdom" within the eschatological scenario, albeit a redefined concept of wisdom that cannot be gleaned by reflection and instead must be revealed, facilitates the uptake of traditional forms from the sapiential tradition. In their new eschatological context, these forms may be altered to a greater or lesser extent and may be juxtaposed or even fused with forms drawn from the prophetic tradition. This apparent fusing of traditions is, in fact, the predictable outcome of the replacement of the traditional notion of wisdom, inherent in creation and accessible to all who will reflect upon it,[100] by the idea of wisdom that must be revealed, which is more characteristic of apocalyptic writings.

The testamentary form that we have been examining in and of itself draws attention to the presence of paraenetic material: within a narrative that presents itself as a testament, one would expect to find such material, an expectation that is surely even greater in a text that has placed such great emphasis on its central figure as a recipient of revealed wisdom. This feature draws attention, in particular, to the unit of material now referred to as The Epistle of Enoch. Nickelsburg is correct to draw attention to the *two-ways* instruction in 91:1–9 (itself closely linked with the material in chapters 81–82 which probably originally formed a bridge between chapters 1–36 and 91–105)[101] in which Methuselah summons his brothers and Enoch exhorts them:

> Hear, O sons of Enoch, every word of your father,
> and listen aright to the voice of my mouth;
> for I testify to you and speak to you, my beloved:
> Love the truth and walk in it[102]

---

[100] As Witherington comments, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 10: "The sages dealt with and drew deductions from the repeatable patterns and moral patterns of ordinary life, both of human life and the life of the larger natural world."

[101] See Nickelsburg's discussion, *1 Enoch 1*, 335–337.

[102] *1 Enoch* 91:3, translation Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 26. See his discussion of this verse on the same page.

The language here, and later in verses 18–19 where the sons are to walk "in the paths of righteousness" and avoid "the paths of violence," is strongly reminiscent of Proverbs 1–8; the reader feels himself to be encountering sapiential material, specifically *instruction*.[103] What is distinct, however, is that in *1 Enoch*, the wisdom that is to be sought is that of Enoch himself. This emerges from the stress in verse 18 that it is Enoch himself who reveals to his sons the paths of righteousness and violence, a verse that in turn recalls 82:1–4, in which Enoch's revelations are written down and transmitted to Methuselah.

Thus, we are dealing here with a different concept of wisdom to that found in Proverbs 1–8. There, wisdom is immanent in creation and may be discerned by reflection; here, wisdom must be revealed. Nevertheless, despite the conceptual difference, both are called "wisdom," and it is noteworthy that *1 Enoch* draws upon traditional wisdom forms, such as the two-ways instruction just mentioned,[104] to present its ethical teaching. What is striking, though, about the forms appropriated is that they are recombined with prophetic elements, as we shall see. Most of what follows is based upon the Epistle of Enoch, in which the paraenetic aspect is seen most clearly.[105] I shall begin, however, with a section from the Book of the Watchers.

Creation Discourses in 1 Enoch

Creation discourses are a common feature of wisdom material, particularly if we agree that certain Psalms are to be classified as "wisdom" psalms.[106] In the material we are considering from *1 Enoch* (bearing

---

[103] This same imagery is used in 92:1 which formally begins the *Epistle of Enoch.* Here Enoch "writes" his "complete sign of wisdom" for his sons and all "who will observe truth and peace." The address to the sons gives the piece an *instructional* tone.

[104] Another such instruction is found in 94:1–5.

[105] It is possible to examine the narrative of the Book of the Watchers as a critique of the Jerusalem priesthood, intended to have an ethical impact on its readers: see Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981), 575–600; D.W. Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in *1 Enoch*." *HUCA* 50 (1979), 115–135. I shall, however, confine myself to those sections that appear to be drawing on traditional wisdom forms.

[106] See Pss 8; 19:1–6; 33; 104; 136; 139. For this classification as Wisdom Psalms, see R.H. Whybray, "The Wisdom Psalms," in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (ed. J. Day, R.P. Gordon and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 152–160. See also E. Gerstenberger, "Psalms" in *Old Testament Form Criticism* (ed. J.H. Hayes; San Antonio: Trinity University, 1974), 212–214. Also note Job 38–41; Proverbs 8:22–31; Sirach 16:24–17:14; 39:12–35; 42:15–43:33; Wisdom 7:15–8:1.

in mind that we are not considering the Book of the Luminaries, chs. 72–82), there are two such discourses: *1 Enoch* 2:1–5:4 and 101:1–9. Both occur in the context of judgement.

1 Enoch *2:1–5:4*

When seen in its wider context of chapters 1 and 5, this section has been classified by Rau[107] and Argall[108] as a *salvation-judgement oracle*, a late prophetic form. Nevertheless, it contains elements that Nickelsburg identifies as "most closely paralleled in the wisdom literature,"[109] and that Argall specifies as being derived from the *creation hymn.*[110] The admonitory nature of the piece, as it constantly calls its audience to consider creation, reinforces the sapiential impression, but it becomes clear in 5:4 that the intended audience is not that of the faithful remnant but of the faithless who "have changed" their "works."[111]

Each line from 2:1–5:3 begins with a verb exhorting the audience to "observe"[112] or "contemplate" aspects of creation. The list of these aspects is comprehensive: from heavenly bodies (2:1) through earthly works (2:2)[113] to signs of summer and winter (3:1–5:1). The reference to the faithfulness of the heavenly bodies with respect to the time of feasts (2:1) hints that a certain calendrical practice may be in the background as an ethical issue. However, it is the play on the Aramaic verb שנה, *to change*, that is most important. The verb occurs in line 2, where nothing on earth changes, a thought set in direct parallelism to line 1, where the luminaries do not "alter" (or "transgress": the root verb is עבר) their paths. The verb is then taken up again in 5:2[114] where it leads into the direct contrast of 5:4:[115]

---

[107] Rau, *Kosmologie*, 106–24, especially 115 and 121. Cited by Argall, who builds upon his conclusions. See below.

[108] Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 101.

[109] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 152.

[110] See Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 101. For descriptions of the form of creation hymns, see Gerstenberger, "Psalms," 209. Argall's point is based on the appropriation of literary devices such as participial style, rhetorical questions, and lists rather than on the occurrence of tripartite creation hymns.

[111] Aramaic is ואנתן שניתן עבדכן, "But you, you have changed your works."

[112] For Aramaic and Greek verbs, see the table of verbs in Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 103. For a discussion of the Ethiopic verbs, including the problem of variants, see Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 1:60–61. The forms are plural throughout.

[113] The call to observe heavenly works and earthly works in lines 1 and 2 may be intended as a merism depicting the totality of creation.

[114] Assuming Milik is correct in his reconstruction of the lacuna in 4QEn^{a} 1 ii from the Greek text C (Milik, *The Book of Enoch*, 149).

[115] In the Ethiopic text, another verse separates these two lines. However, its thought is substantially similar as it speaks of the sea and rivers not changing their courses.

> But you, you have changed (שניתן) your works [and do not do his word; but you trans]gress (תעברון) against him with great and hard (words).

The elements of creation are therefore being cited as condemnatory of the sinners, as a background to the prophetic judgement oracle that will be taken up in 5:5–9. The wisdom elements have, therefore, been enlisted by the prophetic, to which they remain subordinate.

The discussion of the signs of summer and winter in chapters 3 and 4, however, hints at a more nuanced use of eschatology, not simply anticipation of a coming judgement. The verses seem almost paradoxical: they describe the abundant provision of water in the winter months and the corresponding withering of the trees followed by the drought conditions of summer with the corresponding blossoming of the trees. Argall[116] has noted that there is a strong link between the vocabulary of 4:1–5:1 and 5:9: both use the vocabulary of *burning* (the latter "in the heat of wrath" ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ)[117] and both follow this with botanical growth imagery; in the case of 5:9, the righteous will grow (αὔξω) and increase (πληθυνῶ). Argall's suggestion is that the text implies that one must escape the wrath poured out (like the heat of summer) in the judgement by seeking refuge in the Enochic community (as one would seek the shade of trees) who at that time will flourish and bear fruit. He more cautiously suggests that the signs of winter indicate spiritual barrenness (the withered trees) in a time of seeming prosperity (the dew and rain). Argall's suggestion is perhaps reinforced by the stump imagery of Isaiah 6:13 and 11:1: the remnant community is depicted as the life that will sprout from the dead-looking stump in the midst of desolation. If the analysis is correct, then the paradoxical language of 3:1–5:1 reflects the inaugurated eschatology of a remnant community that has been discussed already. We may also note, with Argall, that the function of such imagery is to enjoin the audience to join with and take refuge in the Enochic community. To this we may add a second function: that this section serves a paraenetic function to the righteous to hold fast in their obedience and not to change their ways.

---

[116] Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 106–107.

[117] For the translation "heat of wrath," see Nickelsburg's discussion of the phrase (*1 Enoch 1*, 163) where he notes the LXX rendering of חמה אפו in Isaiah 42:25 by this phrase.

1 Enoch *101:1–9*

This section is reminiscent of that found in 2:1–5:4. The same verbs are used here in enjoining the audience to "contemplate"[118] and "look." Again, the focus is on "the works of the Most High" (101:1), although here greater space is taken up by a discussion of the sea and rivers (mentioned only in passing in the Ethiopic and Greek of 5:3). Again, too, the context is one of judgement, with this section set in juxtaposition to 100:10–13 where the elements of creation are cited as part of a covenant lawsuit or *rib* (**ריב**).[119]

Given the overlap with 2:1–5:4, I shall confine myself to noting two aspects of this passage. First, the sapiential associations of the piece are brought to the fore by the language of "fear" that forms an *inclusio* to the work. Line 1 contains the command "Fear to do evil" and line 9 the statement that "sinners do not fear the Most High." This notion of fearing God and fearing to do evil is a characteristic feature of traditional wisdom.[120] Here, it serves to reinforce the idea that this is a piece of sapiential exhortation.

Second, the addressees of the opening admonition are not the sons of Enoch, but the "sons of men." A universal appeal is being made to human beings to change their ways before they face judgement. There is an important connection to be made between these verses and 105:1–2 where the wisdom that has been transmitted by Enoch to his sons and then to the remnant community is then transmitted to the "sons of the earth," who join Enoch in the paths of truth.[121] In the introduction to his commentary, Nickelsburg[122] highlights the essentially "evangelistic" thrust of these verses: wisdom is given to Enoch and then transmitted to his sons, then to the remnant community of the end time and by them to the sons of the earth. Thus the community sees itself as the mediator of blessing to the world.

---

[118] Note Rau's observation (*Kosmologie*, 87) that this is the only other place in the Enochic corpus where the Greek verb κατανοήσατε is used.

[119] See the discussion in Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 109, 182–183.

[120] See Roland E. Murphy, "Religious Dimensions of Israelite Wisdom," in *Ancient Israelite Wisdom: Essays in Honour of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. Patrick Miller, Paul D. Hanson and S. Dean McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), pages 452–453; and Henri Blocher "The Fear of the Lord as the Principle of Wisdom," *TynBul* 28 (1977), 3–28.

[121] These lines are omitted in some Greek manuscripts, but 4QEn^{c} 5i contains fragmentary evidence that they were part of the Aramaic. See Milik, *The Book of Enoch*, 207 and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 531.

[122] *1 Enoch 1*, 26–28.

Woe Oracles and Exhortations in 1 Enoch

There are seven series of *woe-oracles* of varying length in the Epistle of Enoch.[123] Despite Coughenour's assertion that the *woe-oracle* is an essentially sapiential form,[124] the form has the strongest associations with the classical prophets,[125] of whom Habakkuk is the most similar in employing a string of woes.[126] Nevertheless, the occurrence of such strings of woes in the Epistle, which, as we have seen, presents itself as an instruction, and the clear antithetical parallelism between the woes and the exhortations that are juxtaposed with them,[127] mean that these series take on the character of sapiential material. Again, therefore, we see the merging of prophetic and sapiential elements in the Epistle of Enoch.

The structure of the woe-oracle is fairly clear. Drawing on the work of March,[128] Argall describes the structure as follows:

> In its basic form, the interjection הוי is followed by a participle adjective or noun that describes those being addressed. The offence of the addressees is then specified, often by means of another participial clause and a sentence with a finite verb. A threat usually concludes the oracle.[129]

Argall also draws on the work of Janzen[130] who has noted, regarding the judgement spoken of in the threat clause, that it often approximates the *Talionsstil*, in which the penalty of justice is described as corresponding to the crime. Thus, for instance, in 94:6, those "who build iniquity and violence and lay deceit as a foundation" will "be overthrown,"[131] and

---

[123] 94:6–10; 95:4–7; 96:4–8; 97:7–10; 98:9–99:2; 99:11–16; 100:7–9.

[124] Robert A. Coughenour, "The Woe-oracles in Ethiopic Enoch," *JSJ* 9 (1978), 192–197. Coughenour's case is built on the work of E. Gerstenberger, "The Woe-oracles of the Prophets," *JBL* 81 (1962) 249–263.

[125] See, for example, Isaiah 5:8,11,18, 20–22; 10:1; 17:12; 18:1; 28:1; 29:1,15; 30:1; 33:1; 45:9–10; Jer 22:13; 23:1; 48:1; 50:27; Ez. 13:3,18; 34:2; Amos 5:18; 6:1; Mic. 2:1; Nah. 3:1 Hab. 2:6,9,12,15,19, Zeph 2:5; 3:1; Zech 11:17.

[126] This point is of interest given that the sins condemned in Habakkuk's woes are similar to those condemned in Enoch; the abuse of the poor by the rich.

[127] See for example 95:4 (addressed to sinners), "healing will be far from you," and 96:3 (to the righteous) "Fear not, you who have suffered; for you will receive healing."

[128] W.E. March, "Prophecy," pages 164–165 in Hayes, ed., *Old Testament Form Criticism*, 1974.

[129] Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 196.

[130] Waldemar Janzen, *Mourning Cry and Woe Oracle* (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1972), 81–82. It is important to stress that the clauses only *approximate* the *Talionsstil*; it is perhaps best to understand the punishment as being "appropriate" to the crime committed.

[131] Ethiopic is *yetnaššatu*. It also occurs in the following verse as part of a similar antithesis.

in 94:7–8, those who have "acquired gold and silver" and who have "trusted" in their "riches" will "depart."[132] The use of the Ethiopic adverb *fetuna* ("quickly") in these two lines heightens the expectation of the judgement.

This talionic principle is reflected in the exhortations that are juxtaposed with the woes. The sinners will be delivered into the hand of the righteous, who will be responsible for their judgement (95:3) and have authority over them (96:1). These are the same righteous ones who have been persecuted by the sinners (95:7) and have presumably, therefore, been under the authority conferred on them by their wealth. There is, then, a reversal of situations being promised by the juxtaposing of woes and oracles.

Such an expectation of reversal emerges dramatically in the exhortation to the righteous in 99:3 to petition the angels regarding their oppression by the unrighteous:

> that they may bring in the sins of the unrighteous before the Most High as a reminder.

This language of a "reminder" is also found in 94:4, 96:7 and 97:7, in each place conveying the idea that the sins of the wicked will not be overlooked. It is important, however, to note the connection of the idea in 99:3 to the story in the Book of the Watchers of the cries of humanity rising up to Heaven after the descent of the Watchers.[133] This connection does more than simply establish a connection with the underlying narrative of the Enochic material; it provides a narrative basis for the hope the righteous should have.

While Argall has seen a greater emphasis on religious sins in the last three series of woes,[134] and on social sins in the first four, the fact is that each of the seven strings of woes condemns both social evil, as the rich prosper at the expense of the poor and the wicked at the expense of the righteous,[135] and religious evil,[136] which is particularly concerned with

---

[132] Ethiopic is *tewadde'u.*

[133] It is interesting that the Ethiopic text in 99:3 uses the verb *tenše'u*, "raise," further capturing the connotation. The Greek is προέξεσθε.

[134] Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 209. He connects this shift in emphasis to the presence of Divine Warrior passages in the wider context.

[135] See 94:6–8; 96:4–6,8; 97:8; 98:11; 99:13; 100:7.

[136] References to "iniquity," "blasphemy," "sin," et cetera, occur in 94:6,9; 95:7; 98:12; 99:1–2; 99:14–15; 100:8.

the changing or annulling of some body of teaching.[137] Indeed, it would be wrong of us to introduce a distinction between these two aspects of evil: those who have acquired riches (94:6–8), presumably at the expense of the poor, have committed blasphemy and iniquity (94:9).[138]

The fact that such a scathing attack on the rich brings the work into apparent conflict with the traditional wisdom of act-consequence, in which the rich are rich because of God's blessing[139] is acknowledged and dismissed in 96:4:

> Woe to you sinners, for your riches make you appear to be righteous, but your heart convicts you of being sinners.

This point is of some importance: the Enochic eschatological context, particularly the existence of a remnant community who perceive themselves to be persecuted and look forward to the reversal of that situation, calls for a reappraisal of traditional wisdom. The material in which this reappraisal is found is overwhelmingly eschatological in nature, constantly looking forward to the coming reversal. But the ethical issues raised are *this-worldly*; they are concerned with the abuse of the poor, the injustice of corruption, dishonesty in the legal system,[140] slavery.[141] It should not be overlooked that the exhortations to the righteous to "be hopeful" (96:1) and to "take courage" (97:1) and "fear them not" (95:3), as well as the exhortation to "be prepared" (99:3) are essentially exhortations not to be dragged into compromise with such sinners, a fact reinforced by the beatitude of 99:10, which deliberately contrasts the fate of the righteous with the woes pronounced on the unrighteous:

> And then blessed will be all who listen to the words of the wise,
> and learn to do the commandments of the Most High;
> And walk in the paths of his righteousness,
> **and do not err with the erring,**
> For they will be saved.[142]

Thus, when considered paraenetically, this material is concerned with a fidelity to God that is expressed in *this-worldly* behaviour; it does not

---

[137] See especially 99:2, "Woe to you who change the true words and pervert the eternal covenant," and 98:14, "woe to you who annul the words of the righteous."

[138] Compare the parallelism of 94:1–2, where the "paths of iniquity" parallel the "paths of violence."

[139] Cf. Psalm 112:3.

[140] 95:6.

[141] 98:4.

[142] Translation, Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 482.

simply provide consolation to those who are presently suffering by means of the hope of future reversal.

Disputation Speeches

The term *Disputation Speech* has been used of both prophetic[143] and sapiential[144] material. Essentially, it involves the citation of an opponent's view followed by the writer's answer. These elements are usually introduced formally and a conclusion is also given. In the Epistle, there are four disputations in 102:4–104:8, each of which discusses the question of what the righteous have gained by being faithful to God; two disputations are with the righteous (102:4–103:4 and 103:9–104:6) and two are with the wicked (103:5–8; 104:7–8).

Given that there are substantial discussions of these sections in Argall[145] and Nickelsburg,[146] I shall confine myself to noting two aspects of these speeches. First, given that the subject matter of each of those speeches is the question of what the righteous gain by remaining faithful to God, there is an obvious paraenetic function to these speeches; they are not merely forecasts of doom for the wicked. Second, as Argall in particular notes, the refutation in each of the speeches is based on the special knowledge gained by Enoch on the journeys narrated in the Book of the Watchers. Thus, in 103:1, the response of Enoch to the words spoken by the sinners regarding the death of the righteous is as follows:

> And now I swear to you, the righteous, by the glory of the Great One,
> and by his splendid kingship and his majesty I swear to you,
> That I know this mystery.
> For I have read the tablets of heaven
> and I have seen the writing of what must be.[147]

The reference to the tablets of heaven goes back to 81:1–2, a section which Nickelsburg[148] sees as originally being part of a narrative bridge

---

[143] See Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1967), 201.

[144] See R.E. Murphy, *Wisdom Literature: Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes and Esther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 18. Murphy is discussing Job at this point.

[145] *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 185–196.

[146] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 511–530.

[147] Translation Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 511. See also Nickelsburg's discussion of the "majesty" nouns used here (page 522).

[148] *1 Enoch 1*, 335–337.

between the Book of Watchers and the material in chapters 91–105. The point of note for our study is that the basis for Enoch's paraenesis here is the secret wisdom that has been revealed to the elect and not some wisdom that may be discerned by reflection. Similar points may be made with regard to each of the disputations;[149] each false saying is refuted on the basis of Enoch's secret wisdom.

Form and Ethics in the Enochic Testamentary Collection: Conclusions

The following conclusions arise from our study of the material in The Epistle of Enoch and in The Book of Watchers.

First, by adopting the form of an *instruction*, the material we have looked at presents itself as sapiential. The use of a two-ways discourse in 94:1–6 is very natural in such a context. Nevertheless, the work freely draws upon forms that are more prophetic in nature. Given the fact that the core concept of "wisdom" in the Enochic corpus is of a "revealed wisdom," such a blend of sapiential and prophetic elements seems quite appropriate. In this context, the presence of "heavenly messenger" formulae throughout the Epistle should be noted.[150]

Second, the eschatological expectation of judgement hangs over all of the material. This judgement is presented as the ultimate resolution of the ethical problems of the world. Nevertheless, it serves a twofold paraenetic function that is concerned with the present time: to exhort sinners to change their ways and join with the righteous, and to exhort the righteous to remain steadfast in their commitment. In other words, it would be a mistake to regard the judgement material as either primarily having a theodicial function or a consolatory function. These functions may well be present, but they are neither exclusive nor primary.

Third, while the woe-oracles reveal a concern with ethical issues that are *this-worldly*, the frequent exhortations to fidelity and the creation discourses seem to assume an ethical system that is not specified in the text beyond the designation "the eternal covenant" (99:2). We may cautiously suggest, in the light of this, that the texts therefore assume the

[149] 103:7–8 (second disputation) alludes back to the vision of Sheol in 22:10–11 where there is a compartment in Sheol for sinners who have not been punished in this life.; 104:3 (third disputation) alludes back to 22:12, which speaks of a compartment in Sheol for the martyrs who have cried out to God about the injustice of their deaths; 104:7–8 allude back to 8:2–4 and the reference to the writing down of the deeds of men.

[150] See 94:10; 98:8,10,12; 100:10; 103:7 and note the discussion in Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 45–46.

ethical standards of the Mosaic law, while still holding that the Torah alone is insufficient to effect salvation.

Part 3: The Parables/Similitudes of Enoch

This chapter closes with a study of *1 Enoch* 37–71, the Parables or Similitudes of Enoch. As Darrell Hannah has recently written, "The Similitudes bristle with difficulties,"[151] and it is, therefore, helpful to set them apart somewhat from the rest of the Enochic material that has been surveyed. The difficulties mentioned concern questions of date, authorship, levels of redaction and corruption in transmission. Few would today endorse the proposal of Milik, who saw the work as a third century Christian composition;[152] that proposal has been thoroughly critiqued and rejected.[153] Nevertheless, the discussion remains open as to when the work was composed, what its relationship to Judaism and Christianity might originally have been and the extent to which we may draw detailed conclusions from a work that seems to stand at the end of a lengthy process of transmission and translation.[154] I cannot hope to advance these debates in any meaningful way in what follows, but I think some discussion of them, particularly of the dating issue,

---

[151] D. Hannah, "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch," *ZNW* 94 (2003), 81.

[152] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 91–92. Milik had earlier argued this in "Problèmes de la Littérature hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments araméens de Qumrân," *HTR* 64 (1971), 333 and 375–8.

[153] See J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977), 51–65; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: SCM, 1981), 221–3; J.C. VanderKam, "Messianism and Apocalypticism," in J.J. Collins, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1998), 205. These works all argue for a date around the turn of the era, with the latter two arguing that the Parables come from the first century B.C.E. Michael Knibb has argued for a somewhat later date, suggesting that the work came from the later stages of the first century C.E., in "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25 (1978–9), 345–359, and in "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995), 164–84.

[154] See VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71," in VanderKam, *Revelation and Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSupp 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 421: "one should make only rather humble claims about details in the text." This essay appeared earlier in J.C. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 169–91. All further page references will be to the edition in *Revelation and Canon*.

is required since, at a later stage of this study, it will be necessary to address the question of how the Parables might relate to Matthew.

Dating the Parables

In addition to dealing with the absence of any witness to the Parables at Qumran, questions of date have often focused on two points within the text where there may be historical allusions: 1 En 56:5–7 may possibly be related to the Parthian invasion of 40 B.C.E. or to the later invasion of 115–17 C.E.;[155] 1 En 67:7–9, meanwhile, has been seen as alluding to Herod's visit to Callirhoe to seek a cure for his illness.[156] This second possible allusion has been re-examined recently by Darrell Hannah, who has argued for a date for the completion of the Similitudes around the turn of the era, when the memory of Herod's death was still relatively fresh.[157] We must, I think, be cautious of categorising these as allusions: Suter, in his important work on the composition of the Parables, warns that in both cases we may be dealing with apocalyptic motifs of judgement rather than allusions to concrete historical events.[158] Moreover, even if they are allusions, the possibility remains that they are echoes of older history; while, therefore, they may have some value in establishing the *terminus a quo* of the Parables, they don't have the same value in establishing the *terminus ad quem.*

Of greater significance than these possible historical allusions, perhaps, are the indications that the ouranology and angelology of the Parables reflects a more primitive scheme than the "seven-heavens" one

---

[155] See the discussion in David W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS 47; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 24. The 2nd century date is proposed by J.C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: An Historical Approach," *NTS* 14 (1967–8), 551–65. That the earlier Parthian invasion is in view is advocated by J.C. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon" to H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973), XVII.

[156] Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," XVII. See also A. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, (Leipzig: Vogel, 1853), 206; R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 2nd ed., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912) 134; M. Black, *The Book of Enoch*, (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 242; and A. Schalit, *König Herodes: Der Mann und sein Werk*, (SJ 4; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969) 640, n. 200. I am grateful to Darrell Hannah for alerting me to these references.

[157] D. Hannah, "The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod and the Date of the *Similitudes of Enoch*." This paper was first presented at the "New Testament and Second Temple Judaism" seminar at the British New Testament Society conference, 2005 and is forthcoming in the conference volume of the 2005 meeting of the Enoch Seminar.

[158] Suter, *Tradition and Composition*, 12, 24.

that dates from the first century C.E.[159] 1 En 71:5–7 makes a distinction between heaven and the heaven of heavens, with the divine throne located in the latter; 1 En 14:10–17, in the Book of the Watchers, represents a similar idea in terms of the two houses, one of ice and the other of fire, the latter containing the throne. The scheme in the Parables, then, seems to be of a two-fold heaven, rather than of a seven-fold one and this may point to an earlier date, a possibility that would not be threatened by the question of the integrity of chapter 71 to the book as a whole; if this chapter is early, and yet is (with respect to the rest of the book) a late redactional addition, then the book as a whole must be early. The angelology of the text has also been regarded as early and as reflecting Jewish rather than Christian authorship.[160]

In addition, and perhaps most importantly, an early date would be supported if the suspicion is proven correct that the Parables have been utilised by Matthew. Arguably, such a utilisation is seen particularly in the description of judgement in Matthew 25:31–46, but is also seen at Matt 16:27–28 and 19:28. The point of note in all of these texts is that Matthew has developed his sources (according to the standard Synoptic solutions) and introduced new sayings, so that the Son of Man is not simply a figure delivering judgement sayings but is actually depicted as the eschatological judge, seated "on his glorious throne" (in 19:28 and 25:31, at least: in 16:27–28, the Son of Man comes "with his angels in the glory of his father") in a manner strikingly similar to the character in the Parables.[161] That Matthew has drawn upon the Parables, and not *vice versa*, is not universally agreed, and in addition the possibility must also be considered that there was either an oral or a literary tradition of "Son of Man" sayings that both the evangelist and the author(s) of the Parables were influenced by.[162] What is agreed, however, is that

---

[159] J. Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran: 4QSerek Šîrôt ʿÔlat Haššabbāt," *Congress Volume: Oxford, 1959* (VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), 328–9, 343, 345 notes this point, but also cautions that Revelation also lacks the concept. See also Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses," in idem, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (JSJSupp 50; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 21–54.

[160] Ibid., 343–45.

[161] In particular, 1 En 61:8, 62:2–3.

[162] For the idea of an oral tradition, see J. Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditiongeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (SUNT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975), 160–61. Arguments for a literary tradition are found in M. Black, "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*, 162–5.

Daniel 7:14, which lies in the background of both books, does not present the Son of Man as the eschatological judge:[163] this phenomenon is a departure from the Danielic source material and both Matthew and the Parables make the same development using similar language, implying some kind of connection between the two.

Alistair I. Wilson has recently argued that Matthew consistently portrays Jesus as eschatological judge in chapters 21–25 of the Gospel;[164] the question he leaves unanswered, however, is why the evangelist is so concerned to link this development to the title Son of Man. The Parables, meanwhile, are thoroughly pre-occupied with judgement and while the theme is initially developed in connection with "the Chosen One"[165] (45:3), the final form of the text ultimately develops this into a function of the Son of Man, as part of a tendency to focus all eschatological expectation onto this figure. I will say more about this presently, but at this stage, I think it is noteworthy that while the Parables tend to focus all eschatological roles on the Son of Man, including the most obvious role of judgement, Matthew focuses these roles on Jesus, but when developing the judgement motif he does so specifically by using the imagery of the Son of Man on the glorious throne. This suggests that there is a tradition that Matthew draws on that connects the Son of Man with judgement. It is, then, perhaps more likely that Matthew has drawn upon the Parables, or upon a stage of the Parables' tradition, and not *vice versa.* This conclusion could be supported by Black's argument that the third-person pronominal suffixes of "glorious throne" in the Ethiopic, may indicate definiteness rather than possession:[166] the Son of Man is seated on "*the* glorious throne," that is, the throne of God, the Lord of Spirits. If this is the case,[167] Matthew's description of the Son of Man on "*his* glorious throne"[168] would appear to be a further development of the enthronement imagery, based on a more advanced

[163] Suter, *Tradition and Composition*, 25–6.

[164] A.I. Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen: A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21–25* (Carlisle; Paternoster, 2004).

[165] For a discussion of this, see below.

[166] Black, "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch," 155. This represents a change from the view he had previously expressed, that the Son of Man sat on his own throne, not that of the Lord of Spirits. See Black, *The Book of Enoch* or *1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes by Matthew Black, in Consultation with James C. VanderKam, with an Appendix on the Astronomical Chapters (72–82) by Otto Neugebauer* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 220.

[167] In further support of this, see Hannah, "The Throne of His Glory," 82–85.

[168] Matt 25:31.

identification of the Son of Man with the deity. These elements point, in my view, to Matthew utilising the Parables, not *vice versa*, and suggest an early date.[169]

If this is granted, it is intrinsically more likely that the Parables are Jewish and not Christian. The final identification of the Son of Man with Enoch, in 71:14, would in any case be a difficult one for a Christian to make.[170] The point made above regarding the possible redactional status of this chapter would be transferable to this issue: if a late stage in the redaction of the book is Jewish, it is more likely that the rest of the book is also Jewish.

It is probably fair to say that the balance of opinion among scholars has swung towards seeing the Parables as coming from around the turn of the era, most likely in the first century, and probably being Jewish in origin. Their absence from among the Qumran finds, however, reflects the fact that the Parables represent a distinct development of Enochic traditions, one that assumes other elements of Enochic tradition[171] but has developed these in its own unique way.

A final comment must be made as to the reliability of the text of the Parables for our purposes. As VanderKam notes:

> [O]ne is reduced to working with the Ethiopic rendering which is a granddaughter version of the Similitudes. This fact means that one should make only rather humble claims about details in the text; one simply cannot be sure in many cases what the original might have read.[172]

The caution is salutary, but in what follows the fine detail of individual phrases will be of less significance than the overall impression left by the

---

[169] In addition, J.R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha* (JSJSupp 105; Brill: Leiden, 2005), 136, notes the intrinsic likelihood that this is indeed the direction of dependence: a Jewish Christian work like Matthew would very likely have drawn on a first century Jewish apocalyptic text, but it is far less likely that a later Jewish text would have "structured itself around ideas in a Christian gospel." Davila also notes the evidence for the Parables being influential upon *3 Enoch*, which is "exceedingly difficult to explain unless the Similitudes is a Jewish work" (135). The lateness of *3 Enoch* means that this does little to establish a date for the composition of the Parables, but it is an important piece of evidence to set alongside the other indications that have been explored above.

[170] See Colpe, "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου," *TDNT* 8:427. See also E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund: Skrifter av kungl Humanistika Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 41, 1946), 167.

[171] See Suter, *Tradition and Composition*, in toto. For the dependence of the Parables upon the Book of the Watchers, and for their imitation of the style of this book, see also G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 216.

[172] VanderKam, "Righteous One," 421.

Parables. We can, then, proceed with a little more confidence than we might otherwise draw from VanderKam's comments.

The Eschatology of the Parables

The eschatology of the Parables is very much oriented towards the future, towards the great judgement when the righteous and chosen will be rewarded and the kings and the mighty repaid for their sins. There seems to be a complete lack of realised elements and, at first glance at least, the kind of inaugurated eschatology that I have traced in the other Enochic texts seems to be absent: the great moment of revelation is a future one, when the "hidden things are revealed to the righteous" and "the sinners will be judged."[173]

Nevertheless, there are some indications that an inaugurated eschatology, centred on revealed wisdom, may be assumed by the Parables. At several points in the text there are hints that while the great revelation of God's "hidden things"—including, pre-eminently, the person of the Son of Man—will take place at the judgement, the righteous have already received a partial revelation.

The superscription of the book (37:1–5) may hint at this with its emphasis that Enoch's vision of wisdom (37:1), the words of the Holy One (37:2),[174] are for "the ancients" and for "those who come after"[175] (37:2). The language of "those who come after" recurs in line 3: "from those who come after, let us not withhold the beginning of wisdom."[176] It is not certain that the term denotes a community that has come into existence in the last days, but such an understanding is certainly plausible.

A more striking suggestion of revealed wisdom and inaugurated eschatology is found in chapter 48. This chapter begins with an important connection between wisdom and righteousness:

> In that place I saw the spring of righteousness, and it was inexhaustible,
> and many springs of wisdom surrounded it.
> And all the thirsty drank from them and were filled with wisdom;
> and their dwelling places were with the righteous and chosen. (48:1)[177]

---

[173] 1 En 38:3, translation from G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 51.

[174] Or "the holy words." See Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 50, n.C, for details of the variant readings.

[175] M. Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 194, notes that the Ethiopic expression corresponds to the Hebrew אחרונים or the Greek οἱ ἔσχατοι.

[176] Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 50.

[177] Ibid., 62.

The text links righteousness with wisdom by means of the spring imagery: wisdom and righteousness are springs emerging from the same location, suggestion a close connection between the two. The "righteous" who will be saved and honoured at the judgment must surely, therefore, also be "wise." In the thought-world of the Parables, that means they must have been recipients of some kind of revelation, a point that is developed in line 7, which speaks of the Son of Man, who has been hidden from the world:

> And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and righteous;
> for he has preserved the portion of the righteous.[178]

1 En 49:1 speaks of the fact that wisdom has been "poured out like water," perhaps speaking of this revelation of the Son of Man to the chosen; again, it seems to be a past event.

There is, in these passages, a sense that revelation has taken place in the past in the experience of the righteous. As noted already, however, the great act of revelation is a future one, and in terms of importance this future revelation eclipses that of the past. There may be an important reason for this. John J. Collins has argued that the Chosen Son of Man figure functions as a heavenly counterpart for the righteous.[179] The "hiddenness" of this figure corresponds to the present suffering of the righteous, as their true glory and the splendour that awaits them are, in a sense, veiled to the world. From a narrative point of view, the consolatory function of the Son of Man requires that he is hidden from the world and that his revelation will coincide with the restoration of equity. This explains why there is a preoccupation with a future revelatory act and relatively little said about a past act. This preoccupation, then, need not be seen as being in tension with the emphasis placed on an inaugural revelation seen in the other Enochic texts.

Combined with the frequent use of the term "chosen" to denote the righteous, the texts noted above suggest that in the Parables we have the writings of a group that perceive themselves to be elect and in possession of a privileged knowledge that has been revealed to them by God.

---

[178] Ibid., 62.

[179] J.J. Collins, "The Heavenly Representative: The Son of Man in 1 Enoch," in G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.J. Collins, eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (SBLSCS 12; Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1981), 112–16.

There is no clear evidence that the group understood itself to be eschatological, but this may be a justifiable assumption to make. It is worth noting that in the Parables, as in the other Enochic texts examined in this chapter, salvation is not for "Israel" but for an elect group, here designated the "chosen" and "righteous," a fact that suggests a continuity at this point between these various Enochic texts. This may provide some grounds for seeing the elect group as self-consciously eschatological.

The Son of Man: Revealer and Revealed

What is most striking about the Parables is the way in which they have focused the concept of revealed wisdom on the figure of the Son of Man. A great deal has been written about the depiction of this figure in the parables, and it is unnecessary to rehearse all of it here: our focus must be on the question of the sapiential depiction of the Son of Man and how this might relate to his identity.

There are four epithets used of the central figure, or figures, in the eschatological scenarios of the Parables: Righteous One (*ṣādeq*), Anointed One (*mas/šiḥ/h*), Chosen One (*x/ḥeruy*) and Son of Man (*walda sab', walda be'si, walda 'egwāla 'emma-ḥeyāw*). The first of these occurs only once as an epithet of a single figure; in 53:6, where it is linked with the term "chosen one." Elsewhere it occurs in singular form but probably with a collective meaning.[180] "Anointed one" occurs twice (1 En 48:10 and 52:4), with the first text echoing Psalm 2:2 and the second speaking of the dominion of the anointed one. By contrast to the paucity of occurrences of these first two terms, "Chosen One" occurs fifteen (possibly sixteen) times[181] and the various forms of "Son of Man" occur sixteen times, with *walda 'egwāla 'emma-ḥeyāw* being the most popular (eight occurrences). The latter two titles, therefore, dominate the landscape of the Parables. After 62:1, Son of Man is the only title to be used, thereby taking a certain pre-eminence; nevertheless, "Chosen One" is the only title to occur in all three Parables.

Discussion has at times centred on whether there were two distinct sources for these two main titles among a potential multiplicity of sources for the Parables: a "Chosen One" source and a "Son of Man" source.[182]

---

[180] See VanderKam, "Righteous One," 414–5.

[181] Ibid., 416.

[182] See, for example, Charles, "The Book of Enoch," 64–5 and G. Beer, "Das Buch Henoch," *APAT* 2:227.

Whether or not this is the case[183] within the form of the Parables as we have it, the titles have been thoroughly oriented around a single figure and while the Chosen One may be *le personnage fundamental*,[184] the Son of Man designation ultimately comes to dominate as title.[185] As Thiesohn remarks:

> Man wird also nur mit einer eschatologischen Gestalt in den BR[186] zu rechnen haben.[187]

This figure, the Chosen Son of Man, is portrayed as both the subject and the object of the revelatory act. In 51: 3, the reader is told that at the time of the judgement, the Chosen one will sit upon the throne[188] and "all the secrets of wisdom will go forth from his mouth."[189] He is undoubtedly here a revealer figure. Elsewhere, though, he is portrayed as the thing revealed by God. Thus, in 48:6–7, the Son of Man was:

> chosen and hidden in his [God's] presence before the world was created and forever.
> And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the righteous.[190]

Some kind of trust and knowledge of the Son of Man is a trait of the righteous, but such knowledge requires divine enlightenment: without such divine enabling, humans are blind to the truth of the Son of Man, a fact seen also in the confession of the kings in 63:3–4, where they acknowledge the depth of God's secrets and the splendour of his righteousness. A similar point is also made by the passage speaking of

---

[183] The source theories of Charles and Beer were discussed and rejected by Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 24–33. Also important as discussions of the relationship between the Chosen One and Son of Man traditions are: Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter* (see especially 47–52, 203); J. Coppens, *Le Fils d'Homme vétéro—et intertestamentaire* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982) 125–34.

[184] From Black's summary of Coppens, *Le Fils d'Homme*; "The Messianism of the Parables," 148.

[185] VanderKam, "Righteous One," 432–3, provides three reasons for seeing all four epithets as referring to the same individual. 1) *Equivalence of terms.* An example of this is 1 En 48:6, where the "son of man" is "chosen." 2) *Similarity of descriptions.* The functions and descriptions of the son of man and the chosen one are the same. 3) *Reversal of descriptions.* Some phrases that one would expect to be used of the chosen one are used of the son of man and vice versa.

[186] That is, "Bilderreden": the "Similitudes."

[187] Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 203.

[188] See the discussion of this point above.

[189] Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 65.

[190] Ibid., 62. Compare also 1 En 62:7, which articulates a similar idea.

wisdom's descent and rejection by humanity, in 41:1–2. Without divine enabling, wisdom is not accepted.

These two aspects of the Son of Man, revealer and revealed, are brought together in 46:2–3, where Enoch asks the angel that is with him who the Son of Man is, where he comes from and why he goes with the Head of Days. The answer to his question effectively constitutes a revealing or unveiling of the Son of Man:

> This is the son of man who has righteousness,
> and righteousness dwells with him.
> And all the treasuries of what is hidden he will reveal, for the Lord of Spirits has chosen him.[191]

The passage continues with a description of the Son of Man's role in judgement and in restoring moral equity to the world, themes that are developed throughout the book, but it is noteworthy that the primary function of the Son of Man is revelation.

This last point is interesting and develops the question of how wisdom and apocalypticism relate to one another in the Parables. Generically the Parables constitute an apocalypse, as heavenly truths are revealed to Enoch and by the Son of Man, and reflect an apocalyptic world-view in which such truths *require* to be revealed: they cannot be gleaned simply by meditation. Those truths include a knowledge of the destiny that will await humans, but also of the divine ordering of the cosmos. David Suter's study of the concept of *mashal* in the Parables highlights the connection between these two aspects of revelation.[192] A *mashal* is concerned with points of comparison and while on an obvious level the Parables (*meshalim*) of Enoch compare the fates of the righteous with those of the "kings and the mighty," on another level they compare the divine ordering of the cosmos with the inevitability of judgement and a restoration of equity. This point is nicely illustrated by chapters 41–44, where there is, first, a discussion of the fidelity of sun and moon that culminates:

> In the name of the Lord who made a separation between the light and the darkness,
> and divided the spirits of men,
> and strengthened the spirits of the righteous in the name of his righteousness. (1 En 42:8)[193]

---

[191] Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 60.
[192] D.W. Suter, "Māšāl in the Similitudes of Enoch," *JBL 100* (1981), 193–212.
[193] Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 57.

This is followed by a vision of other heavenly phenomenon ("lightenings" and "stars"; 1 En 43:1) that are weighed in a "righteous balance" according to their light and that "keep faith with one another." Asking about these, Enoch is told:

> The Lord of Spirits has shown you a parable concerning them;
> These are the names of the holy ones who dwell on the earth
> and believe in the name of the Lord of Spirits for ever and ever.

A comparison, a *mashal*, is therefore established between the divine ordering of the cosmos and the eventual destiny of the righteous. Conversely, chapters 59–60 speak of the ordering of the winds and other phenomena and lead into a description of the flood as an act of judgement that gives way to a description of the final judgement.

These *meshalim* constitute the wisdom that is revealed to the chosen, revealed through Enoch to "those who come after," and fully revealed by the Son of Man at the great judgement.[194] The book of Parables is primarily concerned with the revelation of heavenly truths or secrets to Enoch: he, therefore, is the one who is capable of revealing "the treasuries of what is hidden" (46:3).

The Son of Man as King and Judge

Throughout this treatment of the Parables, we have noted the depiction of the Son of Man as seated on the divine throne and enacting judgement and have made a number of comments regarding this. Before concluding, some final observations on this aspect of the Parables may be helpful.

First, the idea of the Son of Man's session on the divine throne probably derives, in some sense, from exegesis of Psalm 110,[195] but it is noteworthy that this has become fused, at 49:3 and 62:2, with language of wisdom and insight drawn from Isaiah 11:2–5. Such a fusion facilitates the Messianic or kingly depiction of the Son of Man, as distinct from his depiction as judge, but it also serves to reinforce his qualification to fulfil the latter function: as the one filled with wisdom, he is perfectly

---

[194] VanderKam, "Righteous One," 422–32, argues that the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man is original to the Parables. See also M. Jaz, "Hénoch et le Fils d'Homme," *La Revue réformée* 30 (1979), 105–19. (It should be noted that Jaz takes the book as a whole as a late post-Christian Jewish polemic, reacting to the Christian use of the term Son of Man). Such a view is not universally accepted: see, for example, Collins, "The Heavenly Representative: The Son of Man in 1 Enoch," 119–124.

[195] See Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 94–98.

equipped to execute judgement reliably. This point is reinforced in 61:9, where the Chosen One is capable of judging the "secret ways" of the Holy Ones in heaven, such is his wisdom. It is interesting that in his cosmological visions of 1 En 41–44, Enoch saw a "righteous balance" in which the heavenly bodies are weighed: perhaps we are intended to see the patriarch as being equipped in his visions to enact judgement, even on the Holy Ones of heaven.

Second, in addition to Psalm 110 and Isaiah 11:2–5, there is general agreement that the *Ebed-Jahweh* figure of Deutero-Isaiah has been influential on the depiction of the Son of Man, though scholars differ on the extent to which this is the case. In particular, the presentation of the Son of Man as *lux gentium* in 1 En 48:4 is seen as being derived from Isa 42:6 and 49:4, with the further possibility that the title "Chosen One" itself is drawn from Isa 42:1. Theisohn has cautioned that the *Ebed-Jahweh* traditions are probably less influential on the Parables than they have sometimes been regarded,[196] but it is perhaps interesting to note that in Matthew, where the Son of Man theme is also developed, Isaiah 42:1–2 has been re-cast as a description of Jesus.[197]

Finally, there is the remarkable fact that, as the one seated upon the divine throne, the Son of Man is worshipped (1 En 46:5; 48:5; 62:6,9). Bauckham takes this as the single example in Second Temple literature of a heavenly figure sharing in the divine identity,[198] though he suggests that the participation in this identity is only partial: the Son of Man "plays no part in the work of creation or indeed in the divine sovereignty until the future day of judgement and therefore his inclusion in the divine identity remains equivocal."[199] The link with the role of judge is important here:

> As the Son of Man is authorised to execute a task usually reserved for God, eschatological judgement, so he is also granted to sit on God's own throne.[200]

---

[196] Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 114–24.

[197] See Richard Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* (SNTSMS 123; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[198] R.J. Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 20.

[199] Ibid., 20.

[200] Hannah, "The Throne of His Glory," 87. The importance of the judgement-role as a basis for the enthronement of the Son of Man overshadows any possible contribution from the identification of the Son of Man with divine wisdom, as Hannah's article in itself testifies (pages 91–93).

Drawing these three points together, what is significant about the depiction of the Son of Man as king and judge is that the sapiential and revelatory dimensions of his role have become thoroughly fused with eschatological ones. These latter functions, while derived from Biblical texts and traditions, are developed in novel way and essentially devolve eschatological functions of God (judgement; the restoration of equity) onto the Son of Man, who plays the role of a divine mediator in a remarkable way, seated on the very throne of God and receiving worship.

Conclusion to the Study of the Parables of Enoch

What is so striking about the Parables of Enoch is that way in which they have clustered sapiential and eschatological ideas around a single figure, who is both the revealer and the revealed. In doing so, the Parables once again re-orient the concept of "wisdom" around the concept of revelation, though here with a much stronger emphasis on what will be revealed at the judgement. They also transform traditional forms: the *mashal* is hardly recognizable as a sapiential form, until the element of comparison is recognized and the absolute importance of eschatology to the author(s) of the Parables acknowledged. In addition, divine eschatological functions have been devolved upon the figure of the Son of Man, thus further integrating sapiential and apocalyptic traditions as this sagacious figure becomes also the judge who is seated upon God's throne.

When our study turns to the Gospel of Matthew we will note again the striking similarity in the way in which the revealer-figure is depicted as being seated on the throne and enacting judgement.

Chapter Conclusions

The study of the Enochic testament has highlighted that the eschatology of the text is best understood as "inaugurated," and that the revealing of wisdom to a chosen minority or remnant is the key inaugural event. Whether or not Mosaic Torah was rejected by those who belong to the Enochic group, it was clearly inadequate for salvation, which could be attained only by receiving Enoch's wisdom. The stress on wisdom underlies the sapiential character of much of the Enochic material, as it draws upon forms from the Wisdom tradition. Yet these forms are

juxtaposed and fused with prophetic elements, reflecting the ideological context in which they are now to be found.

With the Parables of Enoch we find the interesting development that the concept of revealed wisdom has become sharply focused on the person of the Son of Man, who is both revealer and revealed. His wisdom equips him to fulfil the role of eschatological judge, which is devolved upon him by God and, as the one seated upon the throne, he receives worship and praise. The Parables seem to assume an inaugurated eschatology, despite the fact that they are strongly oriented towards the future judgement, which in itself will be the great moment of revelation.

CHAPTER THREE

4QINSTRUCTION

4QInstruction is one of the longer texts found in the caves at Qumran. It is highly fragmentary in nature,[1] and the process of reconstruction has been a difficult one,[2] with the result that only recently has the text received the kind of attention it deserves. In 2001, Eibert Tigchelaar would note that work on the actual content of the text was still at an early stage,[3] but in the short span of time since then a number of studies have appeared, most notably Matthew J. Goff's, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*,[4] which at the time of writing represents the most extensive and thorough discussion of the concepts operative in the document.

---

[1] The comments of George J. Brooke concerning the Qumran wisdom texts in general ("Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," in *The Wisdom texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* [ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159. Leuven: Peeters Press, 2002], 202–3), bear repeating here: "[F]or the most part the wisdom texts are extant only in a fragmentary form with no largely complex exemplars such as can be found in the more complete manuscripts from cave 1 and 11. This observation is significant because it means that there is little or no basis for any overall comparison between the wisdom compositions found at Qumran and those compositions which were subsequently collected together for inclusion within the collection of Writings (Kethubim) later to be found in the Bible itself. There are no titles, no attributions of authorship, no colophons defining purpose and intention." Brooke's comments, in particular his last statements regarding intention, are salutary. For the purposes of this study, as we try to identify underlying ideas, they are a warning to proceed with caution and with due sensitivity to nature of the source material.

[2] For discussions of the reconstruction of the text see John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, with Torleif Elgvin, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XXXIV. Qumran Cave 4 XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Mûsār lᵉMāvîn): 4Q415ff. With a re-edition of 1Q26 by John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, S.J. And an Edition of 4Q423 by Torleif Elgvin, in Consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999; Torleif Elgvin, "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A," in *RQ* 16 (1995) 559–580 and especially Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones; Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill 2001), 1–169. This work includes critical evaluation of both of the preceding works and is an invaluable and necessary supplement to *DJD XXXIV*.

[3] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 4.

[4] Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003). Goff's work appeared after I had written the first draft of this chapter for my doctoral research. His conclusions are rather close to my own early findings, although not identical.

Previously known as *Sapiential Work A, 4QInstruction* is essentially a loosely structured collection[5] of ethical and paraenetic material, introduced and punctuated by reflections on the importance of wisdom and by eschatological descriptions. It is generally acknowledged that it lacks the signature features of the sectarian works from Qumran,[6] but the presence of six or more copies[7] of the text among the caves (1Q26, 4Q415, 416, 417, 418, 423) may point to its importance to the sectarians, though in what sense is not clear.[8]

Part 1: The Eschatology of 4QInstruction

As I did with *1 Enoch*, I shall begin by examining the eschatology of *4QInstruction*[9] before proceeding to note the effect of this eschatology on form and ethics. Three elements shall be isolated and studied within this

---

[5] *DJD XXXIV*, 17: "the parts are more important than the whole and the overall outline needs not follow a tight logic."

[6] D.J. Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A," in Hempel et al., *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 263, notes: "Although it shares some vocabulary and concepts with such 'sectarian' works as the *Rule of the Community* and *Hodayot*, it contains none of their distinctively sectarian features and organizational figures."

To my knowledge, only Daryl Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Gorgias Dissertations, Near Eastern Studies 3; New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2002), has argued that *4QInstruction* is sectarian. See, especially, page 323, where he concludes that while sectarian the work was "extra-Qumran," and addressed Essenes living outside of the Qumran community.

[7] See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 1, n. 2, for the details and bibliography of the discussion of whether the fragments of 4Q418 may actually represent two or even three original manuscripts.

[8] Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom," 263, writes, "Whether it was directly associated with the Jewish movement of which Qumran was a part, or was simply regarded as 'good reading' at Qumran, is not clear." In the same volume, Charlotte Hempel's article "The Qumran Sapiential Texts and the Rule Books," further explores the question of whether there are any indicators of sectarianism in the wisdom texts and what their relationship to the sectarians might be. The article is an important contribution to the discussion, with much helpful detail, but is rather admirably inconclusive: "To conclude, it emerges from the discussion offered above that the relationship between the Qumran sapiential texts and the Rule Books is a complex one. I was only able to scratch the surface on this occasion." (294). For further reference to this article, see the discussion of the Book/Vision of Hagu, below.

[9] A good overview of the eschatological teaching in *4QInstruction* is found in J.J. Collins, "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International symposium of the Orion Centre for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* (ed. J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 49–66.

eschatology: the future judgement, the possession of revealed wisdom by the remnant and the restoration of creation.

1. *The Future Judgement*

Elgvin has drawn attention to the fact that the future elements of the eschatology of *4QInstruction* are not as detailed as those of other writings of the time, such as *1 Enoch.*[10] Nevertheless, Elgvin himself points out that:

> An eschatological discourse on the coming judgement occupies a full two columns of the work.[11]

The most striking description of judgement is found in 4Q416 1 (supplemented with 4Q418* 1,2 , 2b, 4Q418 229 and a number of smaller fragments of 4Q418),[12] a passage that comes near the beginning of the work:

10. in Heaven he shall pronounce judgement upon the works of wickedness and all his faithful children will be favourably accepted by [
11. its end. And they shall be in terror. And all who defiled themselves in it shall cry out. For the heavens *shall see* [and the earth too shall be shaken (from its place)]
12. The [s]eas and the depths shall be in terror. And all who defiled themselves in it shall be in terror, and every spirit of flesh will be *laid bare.* But the sons of heaven [in the day of]
13. its [judge]ment. And all iniquity shall come to an end, while the period of truth will be completed [
14. in all periods of eternity, for he is a God of truth.[13]

---

[10] Torleif Elgvin, "Early Essene Eschatology," 142.

[11] Ibid., 128.

[12] See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 175.

[13] This translation is Tigchelaar's, ibid., 176. I have departed from him (italicised words) in verses 11 and 12, where I have seen a possible chiastic structure based on translating **יראו** as the 3rd. person plural Qal imperfect of of **ראה**, "to see" rather than following Tigchelaar in rendering "they will fear", based on the root **ירא**. Such a rendering prompts me to follow the *DJD XXXIV* editors in reading **ויתערערו**, following 4Q416 1, "every spirit of flesh **will be laid bare**" rather than following Tigchelaar by substituting [ ]**ויתר** (from 4Q418* 2 4; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 180) and postulating a meaning "they will cry out." The chiasm is therefore as follows:

The heavens will see
shaken from its place will be the earth
and the seas and the depths will be in terror
And every spirit of flesh will be laid bare.

The point, however, is not important to my argument.

This passage depicts the final judgement as involving not only the punishment of individuals, a theme that emerges more clearly in 4Q418 55 and 69 ii,[14] but also the very eradication of iniquity (line 13), a fact that emphasises both the finality of the judgement and the cleansing of the creation.

A dualism between the righteous and the wicked may be seen to be emerging in this text, notably in the reference to the "spirit of flesh" and the "sons of heaven" in line 12. This imagery, and the potential dualism it reflects, will be studied in more depth below, in the context of 4Q417 1 i 14–18, the "vision of Hagu" passage. Some initial comments may be made here, however. Frey has seen in the references to "flesh" and "heaven" a fundamental dualism that ultimately influenced the thought of Paul.[15] Against this, however, Tigchelaar has preferred to see "spirit of flesh" as a reference to all living things rather than as a pejorative term, and therefore rejects a dualistic interpretation.[16] A conclusion as to which is right is made more difficult by the fact that a lacuna obscures the verb that would allow us to know what exactly it is that the "sons of heaven" do. The structure of the text, however, would seem to imply that the key point is that the "sons of heaven" do not react to the judgement with the same fear as "every spirit of flesh", implying that they have confidence as to their righteous status before God. Thus, at the judgement, the two groups appear to fall on different sides of the great divide. A dualistic interpretation of the text seems, therefore, to be required.[17]

Regardless of whether such a dualism is present in the lines just examined, it is certainly the case that it emerges elsewhere in the work, most notably in 4Q418 69 ii. Here, the judgement is described upon those

---

[14] See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 209–210.

[15] Jörg Frey, "The Notion of Flesh in *4QInstruction* and the Background of Pauline Usage" in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. (ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226. Frey has revisited the subject in, "Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Wisdom Texts," in Hempel, et al., *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 367–404.

[16] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 186–188.

[17] See also Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 80–123. The question of the relationship of the thought here to Pauline dualism remains open to discussion, however. Goff also notes the possibility that the language of "sons of heaven" presents the salvation of the righteous as involving an angelic afterlife (208).

who are termed the "foolish of heart"[18] The events are described in a second person address in lines 4–9; in line 10, the attention then shifts to the righteous who are addressed as "the chosen ones of the truth."[19] The antithesis established, therefore, is between the "chosen ones of the truth" and the "foolish of heart," a dualism reminiscent of that seen in the Apocalypse of Weeks, where the elect are given wisdom at the end of the present age.[20] This antithesis is developed by the phrases that occur in parallel with "chosen ones": they are "searchers of understanding" and "those who keep watch over all knowledge." Thus, we are left with a dualism between the "wise" and the "foolish", similar to that seen in the traditional Jewish wisdom of Proverbs and Psalm 1, but with an additional element: the "wise" are those who have been elected to partake in the eschatological salvation.[21] This connects naturally with the next element of the eschatology of *4QInstruction.*

2. *The Possession of Revealed Wisdom by the Remnant*

Arguably, the dualism seen above in terms of the judgement has a present dimension: 4Q418 81 i 1&2 address the reader as one who has been separated from "every spirit of flesh." The text then continues to speak of the addressee using the terminology of priesthood borrowed from Numbers 18:20: "I am your portion and inheritance among the children of Israel." As this language is taken up in *4QInstruction*, a subtle change is made: God is now the addressee's inheritance among the "children of mankind" (בני אדם). Elgvin sees in this a reinterpretation of priestly language referring to the reader as a member of the eschatological community.[22] He buttresses his case by noting the presence in line 13 of the phrase, "his sprout for an eternal planting" (פארתו למטעת עולם). The phrase, "eternal planting,"[23] depicts the faithful remnant in *1 Enoch*

---

[18] אוילי לב, line 4.

[19] בתירי אמת.

[20] I Enoch 93:10, See the comments by Nickelsburg in the introduction to his commentary, *1 Enoch 1*, 41–42.

[21] See Goff's comments regarding the development of traditional wisdom. *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 216–219.

[22] Pages 120–126 of Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation," in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments.* (ed. F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson. JSOTSS 290. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998), 113–150.

[23] For further discussions of the "eternal plant" imagery, see Patrick A. Tiller, "The Eternal Planting in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997), 312–35; Shozo Fujita, "The Metaphor of the Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (1976),

93:10, where it redefines its earlier use as describing Israel in 93:5. The term may be drawn from Isaiah 61:3 where it occurs with the same meaning of a remnant, but without the adjective "eternal." Among the Qumran texts it occurs also in 1QH[a] 16:6; here too, it carries this same sense of a remnant. Tigchelaar has challenged Elgvin's view, preferring to see the text, at this point, as addressing those of Aaronic lineage.[24] His response, however, does not actually provide any counter to Elgvin's evidence for the eschatological significance of מטעת עולם. Nor does it deal with the fact that the change from God being the priests' inheritance "among the sons of Israel" to being the reader's inheritance "among the sons of men" would appear to be a shift in an eschatological direction, looking towards the remnant's priestly function towards humanity as a whole.[25]

Crucially, Elgvin sees the notion of revealed wisdom as a key element of such a realised eschatology. On this level, he notes in particular 4Q417 2 i 11–13:

> and in a proper understanding he will k[now the hid]den things of His thought when he walks in [p]erfecti[on in all] his d[ee]ds. Seek them always, and look [at al]l their outcome. Then you will have knowledge of [eterna]l glory [wi]th the mysteries of His wonder and His mighty deeds.[26]

Regarding this he comments:

> The elect has access to the hidden mysteries of God: when he meditates on the deeds of God and their consequences and when he understands the times, he will have knowledge of eternal glory and God's wonderful

30–45. With regard to Elgvin's argument and the use of the phrase in *4QInstruction*, see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "*4QInstruction* and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation," in Hempel, et al., *The Wisdom texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 249–57.

[24] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 234–236.

[25] Cf. Exodus 19:6. For this element in eschatological thinking, a shift towards the remnant community being the source of salvation for humanity more broadly, see Nickelsburg's comments on *The Animal Apocalypse*: "Israel's story stands in the broader context of humanity's story, and the nations deliverance from its enemies is a first step toward the re-creation and reuniting of the whole human race. That ultimate reconciliation emanates from within Israel, with the appearance of the great white bull that is described in language at home in Davidic messianic speculation. But the symbol of the bull and the transformation that ensues takes the human story back to its pre-Israelite beginnings. Through the re-creation of the whole human race God will accomplish what failed with the first family and with their counterparts who came out of the Ark." (*1 Enoch 1*, 356–357).

[26] Translation, Elgvin, "Early Essene Eschatology," 144.

> mysteries. Salvation is present, already the elect has knowledge of eternal glory.[27]

In order to develop our understanding of the role of revealed wisdom within the eschatology of *4QInstruction*, we must consider the importance of one of the key phrases in the text: רז נהיה. This phrase occurs very frequently in *4QInstruction*: including reconstructions, Harrington suggests it occurs about thirty times:

> It is so frequent and so regular in the work that when we find either word alone and need to fill in a lacuna, we can add the missing word with some confidence.[28]

Both words within the phrase are anarthrous, although the usage of the phrase, as shall be seen, seems to be definite. רז is a Persian loanword, meaning "mystery"; it occurs commonly in the Qumran texts but usually in the construct plural form (רזי). The only other work that appears to attest the form רז נהיה, as we have it here in *4QInstruction*, is *The Book of Mysteries* (1Q27 and 4Q299–301). נהיה is generally taken to be the *nip'al* participle of the verb היה, "to be" (נִהְיֶה); from this, Milik gave the phrase a future sense, "the mystery that is to be/come,"[29] a translation followed by Harrington and Strugnell,[30] while García Martínez/Tigchelaar, Wacholder, and Lange have preferred "the mystery of being/existence."[31]

The meaning of the phrase may, however, only be properly understood when we consider the contexts in which it occurs and the phrases that occur in parallel with it. Elgvin notes first of all that:

> The most frequent context of this phrase in *4QInstruction* is הגה/דרוש/קח/הבט ברז נהיה "Meditate/search/gaze into the mystery to come" (7 times) and ברז נהיה (מבינים) אוזנכה אוזן (אל) גלה אשר "as he

[27] Ibid., 144.

[28] D.J. Harrington, "The *Rāz Nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423)", *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996) 550.

[29] D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1, DJD I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 101–102.

[30] In *DJD XXXIV*.

[31] See Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, (Leiden: Brill 2000), 845–879; Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: the Hebrew and Aramaic Scrolls from Cave Four. Facsicle 2I*, (Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1992), 44–53; Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*, (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill 1995), 52–53.

opened your ear (the ear of those who understand) to the mystery to come" (8 times).[32]

The strong emphasis here on the role of God opening the ears of the elect should not be overlooked; it is sharply reminiscent of the language of the giving of wisdom/opening of eyes in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in the Animal Apocalypse.

Reflection on the parallel expressions reveals a breadth to the concept of רז נהיה that cannot be reduced to the future sense suggested by Milik *et al.* 4Q417 2 i 5–11 links רז נהיה to the creation,[33] and 4Q418 123 ii 2–8 seems to link the term to the periods (קצים) of the past, present and future ("everything that is in it with what came into being and what will be").[34] The future sense is not excluded, however: 4Q417 1 i 10–11 exhorts the reader to gaze into the רז נהיה and "understand the birth-time of salvation and know who is to inherit glory and iniquity," a notion echoed by 4Q418 2 i 18. In the light of this range of temporal associations, a rendering such as Elgvin's, "the mystery that is coming into being/ the unfolding mystery"[35] becomes attractive.[36]

The breadth of רז נהיה lies not only in its relation to time, however. In 4Q416 2 iii 9 it is linked to proper *obedience*: "you shall know what is allotted to it and you shall walk in righteousness." Similarly 4Q417 2 i 7: "you shall know to distinguish between good and evil." In 4Q416 2 iii 17–18, the term becomes the basis for an exhortation to honour one's parents.[37]

In the light of all of this, what exactly is רז נהיה? Various suggestions have been put forward, with a common denominator in some being the possibility that the term corresponds in some sense to the "vision of Hagu"[38] in 4Q417 1 i 14–18.[39] A discussion of this passage is, therefore, required before we can proceed and will be valuable not simply for

---

[32] Elgvin, "Mystery," 131–139.

[33] See Elgvin, "Mystery", p. 135. Also *idem*, "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic," in Falk et al., *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 24–25.

[34] Elgvin, "Mystery," 134.

[35] Elgvin, "Judgement and Salvation," 134.

[36] For this temporally broad understanding of the phrase, see Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 54–55.

[37] Lange, *Weisheit*, 58–59, makes much of this fragment and the close links with the Mosaic Torah, a point to which we shall return below.

[38] This word is transcribed variously as "Hagu," "Hagi" and "Hago." In what follows, I will use "Hagu." Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 80, n. 2, notes that the different spellings have no impact on interpretation.

[39] This fragment was formerly numbered 4Q417 2.

assessing the arguments concerning רז נהיה, but also for an understanding of the dualism of *4QInstruction.*

The translation of these verses in *DJDXXXIV* is as follows:

> 14. *O* understanding one, study (*inherit?*) thy reward, Remembering *the re*[*quital, for*] *it* comes. Engraved is the/thy ordinance/destiny, And ordained is all the punishment.
> 15. For engraved *is* that which is ordained by God *against* all the *ini*[*quities of*] the children of שׂוֹת, *And* written in His presence *is* a book of memorial
> 16. of those who keep His word. And that *is* the appearance/*vision of the meditation* on a book of memorial. And *He*/שׂוֹת (?) *gave* it as an inheritance to *Man/Enosh Together with* a spiritual people. F[o]r
> 17. according to the pattern of the Holy Ones is *his* (man's) fashioning. *But* no more *has* meditation been given to *a* (?) fleshly spirit, For *it* (sc. Flesh) knew/knows not the difference between
> 18. [goo]d and evil according to the judgement of *its* [sp]irit. *vacat* And thou, o understanding child, gaze on the mystery that is to come, And know[40]

A number of problematic terms and reconstructions are evident from the translation.[41] Less immediately obvious are the difficulties inherent in line 16, in the phrase והואה חזון ההגוי לספר זכרון. The final two words in this phrase are simple enough:[42] a "book of memorial" is mentioned also at the end of line 15.[43] What we should make of חזון ההגוי is less straightforward, however. The phrase is introduced by a pronoun (והואה) that may have a deictic function,[44] in which case it expands specifically on the earlier reference to the "book of memorial," or it may simply refer back to the entire preceding scene.[45] In either case, it establishes a close link between the Vision of Hagu and this "book of memorial," a link taken up in the following phrase in line 16. This book of memorial, in turn, is set in parallel to the engraved law decreed by God against the sins of the "sons of Seth/Sheth."[46] ההגוי could be

---

[40] *DJDXXXIV*, 155.

[41] In addition to the discussion of these in *DJDXXXIV*, 154, see also Goff's analysis of the text critical issues, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 84–88.

[42] There is, however, some uncertainty over the *lāmed* that precedes ספר.

[43] The phrase seems to have been borrowed from Malachi 3:16.

[44] See Goff's arguments, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 93, n. 59. This understanding differs from that of the editors of *DJDXXXIV*, 164, who reject this possibility on the grounds that it would make the passage "repetitious."

[45] This is the preferred interpretation of the *DJDXXXIV* editors.

[46] Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 87–88, takes this to be a reference to the patriarch Seth, son of Adam, linking the reference to the myth of the fall of the angels, associ-

read as simply referring to the act of meditation, so that the phrase as a whole would be translated as in *DJDXXXIV*, in the translation above, or as "meditated vision."[47] The obvious similarity with the expression "book of Hagu," which occurs in CD 10:6 and 1QSa 1:6–7, however, raises the possibility that we are dealing with something with definite content.

Lange follows such an understanding, and sees it as the pre-existent sapiential order of creation, which he equates with the heavenly form of the Mosaic Torah:

> Inhalt dieses Buches ist die präexistente Ordnung von Seit und Welt, welche die Schöpfungsordnung, die Aufteilung der Wirklichkeit in Gut und Böse, Weisheit und Torheit, Wahrheit und Frevel, Geist des Fleisches und Volk des Geistes und die sich in der Thora artikulierende ethische Ordnung der Welt enthält.[48]

Lange's argument sets the reference to the Vision of Hagu in the context of the idea of "heavenly books" in Judaism.[49] His equation of this vision specifically with a heavenly Torah is based largely on his understanding of "engraved is the/thy ordinance/destiny, And ordained is all the punishment," in line 14, as being a reference to the Sinai event (and, in particular, to Exodus 32:16).[50] For Lange, this is to be equated with רז נהיה, so that this phrase, wherever it occurs in *4QInstruction*, denotes a pre-existent heavenly Torah. This notion could possibly find some support in a fragment mentioned by Harrington[51] (4Q418 184 ii) in which רז נהיה occurs near a phrase that could be read ביד משה, "by the hand of Moses," though this latter phrase is not especially clear.

---

ated in rabbinic tradition with the "generation of Enosh." Against this, Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 90–1, notes two important facts. First, the fallen angels or the humans with which they mingle are nowhere in Second Temple literature designated the "sons of Seth." Second, the patriarch Seth is typically portrayed in a positive light. A third problem is noted by the editors of *DJDXXXIV*, 163: the name of the patriarch is not usually found at Qumran with the *plene* spelling. Much more likely is that בני שית is either an allusion to Numbers 24:17, which speaks of the destruction of a Moabite tribe called the Shethites, or, as Elgvin has argued ("The Mystery to Come," 141) that it should be translated as "sons of perdition."

[47] This is the interpretation and translation advocated by Cana Werman, "What is the *Book of Hagu?*" in Collins *et al., Sapiential Perspectives*, 125–40. She argues that it refers to the addressee meditating upon his life and history.

[48] *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 89.

[49] Ibid., 72–79.

[50] Ibid., 80–82.

[51] Harrington, "Raz Nihyeh," 552.

Three criticisms of Lange's argument may be made. First, as Goff notes, phrases that are similar to חרות החוק occur elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls without relation to the Torah:

> The phrase חוק חרות, for example occurs in 1QS 10:1, 6, and 8 as a way to describe the harmony of the created order and the subsequent regularity with which the speaker will give divine praise…In 1QS 10:11 the phrase is used to describe the speaker's awareness of his own sin.[52]

Second, if Lange was correct, it would surely be surprising that there is nothing else said about the Torah in *4QInstruction*: Torah is not praised or thematised here, as it is in Sirach.[53] Thirdly, the antithesis between the "sons of Sheth" and "those who keep his word" suggests a similar antithesis between the "engraved ordinance" and the "book of memorial/Vision of Hagu," rather than the two being identical, as Lange takes them to be.

Elgvin also sees the Vision of Hagu as key, but in a rather different way to Lange. His view is that "*raz nihyeh* is a comprehensive word for God's mysterious plan for creation and history, his plan for man and for redemption of the elect. It is salvation history in a wider meaning. These mysteries are revealed to the elect."[54] He sees these mysteries as contained in both biblical and more sectarian books[55] but also suggests that the heavenly Book of Hagu may be equated with the writings associated with Enoch.[56] This latter point is essentially a product of Elgvin's conviction that *4QInstruction* draws directly on the Enochic tradition. It is worth quoting the conclusions of Loren Stuckenbruck's assessment of Elgvin's arguments for such dependence:

> The present review of evidence adduced by Elgvin in favour of a literary relationship of dependence between *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction* confirms significant parallels that demonstrate the usefulness of comparisons between the two traditions. It is not impossible that the Enochic texts have exerted an influence on ideas found in the sapiential document. At the same time, however, the specific claim that *4QInstruction* drew directly on the Enochic tradition in formulating its ideas is difficult to substantiate.[57]

---

[52] Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 88, n. 40.
[53] Ibid., 88; see also 73.
[54] Elgvin, "Mystery," 135.
[55] Ibid., 131.
[56] Ibid., 146–147.
[57] L. Stuckenbruck, "*4QInstruction* and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions," 261.

If we accept Stuckenbruck's assessment, Elgvin's equating of the Vision of Hagu with the writings of Enoch, while interesting, is ultimately unverifiable.

The precise meaning of חזון ההגוי, then, and its relation to רז נהיה remain elusive. The context of the former phrase, however, can continue to inform our understanding of the latter. Specifically, whatever the Vision of Hagu or the book of memorial might be, they are given to "Enosh, together with a spiritual people" (line 16) and withheld or withdrawn from the "fleshly spirit" (line 17). The reference to Enosh is interesting. Lange understands it as being to the son of the patriarch Seth, although this understanding is based on his belief that שות refers to the patriarch in line 15, an interpretation that is questionable at best.[58] Collins notes evidence for the positive (and occasionally negative) appraisal of the patriarch Enosh in Jewish literature[59] but prefers to see שונא as a reference to Adam, the prototype of humanity, a reading warranted by the Instruction on the Two Spirits.[60] This reading allows Collins to make sense of יצרו, "his fashioning," and its description as being "according to the pattern of the Holy Ones" in line 17: approaching this through the lens of Genesis Rabbah 14, which has Adam partaking of the character of the celestial beings, he suggests that Adam/Enosh is made in the likeness of angels and partakes of special revelation.[61] But there is, according to Collins, the possibility of a double creation, a duality in human existence derived from the exposition of Genesis 1:26 and 2:7. In Philo, this duality is understood, within his particular philosophical framework, in terms of the heavenly and the earthly man;[62] in *4QInstruction*, it is understood in terms of the absolute distinction between the righteous and the unrighteous, those who are spiritual and those who are fleshly, those who have received revelation and those who have not. Thus, there is a dualism between the "spiritual people" and the "fleshly spirit," one that we are now in a position to read back into the antithesis of 4Q416 1 12, with its contrast of the "spirit of flesh"

---

[58] See above, note 46.

[59] J.J. Collins, "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: the Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich, STDJ 30, Leiden: Brill, 1999), 610–2.

[60] Ibid., 612.

[61] An idea attested in the later tradition transmitted in the Armenian Apocryphon, *The Letter Sent to Adam by God.* See Collins, "In the Likeness," 615.

[62] *Allegorical Interpretation* 31. See Collins, "In the Likeness," 617.

and "sons of truth." The key point is that this distinction centres on the possession (or not) of revealed wisdom. It is interesting that line 18 of 4Q417 1 i contrasts the ignorance of the fleshly spirit with the מבין, who is enjoined to "gaze upon רז נהיה."

Even at this stage of research, it seems impossible to know exactly what רז נהיה actually is, though the discussion above, and those on which it draws, goes some way to filling out our understanding of the phrase. I would suggest that in discussion of the phrase we bear in mind that it may originally (prior, even, to the composition of *4QInstruction*) have had a very definite sense, perhaps relating to some part of the writings associated with Enoch, but that over time, as the phrase was transmitted, it may have acquired a much broader field of associations. Thus, it may be that as *4QInstruction* was read within the *yaḥad*, the phrase had come to be associated with all of the writings and teachings regarded by that community as authoritative, or with authoritative interpretations of Scripture. This is speculative, but it does seem to me to be important that we recognize that the sense of רז נהיה need not have been fixed. As we study *4QInstruction*, it seems wise to restrict ourselves to observing a field of significance for the phrase, rather than a specific definition. On this level, three points may be isolated from the discussion above:

1. רז נהיה is *revealed* wisdom. The most common context in which it appears is "as he (God) has opened your ears to רז נהיה."
2. This revealed wisdom is the basis for the addressee's ethical discernment: in 4Q417 2 i 7, reflection on רז נהיה enables the addressee to "know to distinguish between good and evil," an idea emerging also in 4Q416 2 iii 9 ("you shall know what is allotted to it and you shall walk in righteousness.")
3. Possession of this wisdom will bring eschatological blessing and may itself be an eschatological blessing: 4Q417 1 i 10–11 exhorts the reader to gaze into the רז נהיה and "understand the birth-time of salvation and know who is to inherit glory and iniquity," a reference that suggests that the eschaton is in its birth-time. Understood in connection with the "planting" imagery discussed already, this reference points to an inaugurated or realised element in the eschatology of *4QInstruction*.[63]

[63] Relevant to the whole preceding discussion of *raz nihyeh* is J.J. Collins's comparison of the concept of "mystery" in *4QInstruction* and *Wisdom of Solomon*: "The Mysteries of God. Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon," in F. García Martínez, ed., *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 287–305, especially 288–91.

Given what has just been discussed, it is perhaps surprising that no-one has seen eschatological connotations in the word מבין (Māvîn). This word is the standard address to the reader[64] and is probably best rendered as "Understanding One."[65] As a term in its own right it obviously carries no special eschatological connotations. But set against the scheme of thought that has been discussed, in which to be an understanding one is to be part of the chosen people of God, to be one to whom has been revealed the רז נהיה and who will therefore experience eschatological salvation, the natural association of the term is an eschatological one. I would, therefore, cautiously suggest that the use of the term indicates that the addressee is one of the eschatological elect.

3. *The Community as Restored Creation*

The third element of the eschatology of *4QInstruction* is more debatable. It emerges from a consideration of 4Q423 1 and 2 i. The text of these fragments, according to Elgvin, "paraphrases and interprets the Garden of Eden story of Genesis 2–3."[66] The tree of knowledge appears to occupy a central place (lines 1 and 2), though without the negative associations that this element has in the Genesis narrative. The text essentially establishes a contrast between those who are faithful and those who are not (line 4 reads: "in your being unfaithful."), a contrast that is expressed further in the *two-ways* language in line 8 ("[be]tween his way and the way of ["). The Eden imagery is related to the addressee of *4QInstruction* by the use of the 2nd person form in line 2 ("He has set you in charge of it, to till it and guard it"). Likewise, the use of 2nd person forms in 3–6, which employ the imagery of the curse of Genesis 3, establishes a link with the addressee's own time. This second link, however, is intended to lead in to the description of the "remnant" community to which the addressee now belongs. That such a community is in mind here is indicated by the use of the term "planting" (מטע). Elgvin notes the association of this term with some kind of remnant community throughout Jewish writings,[67] from Isaiah 60:21 through a number of references in Qumran texts—notably 1QH^a 16—Jubilees, Psalms of Solomon and *1 Enoch*.

---

[64] The readings may conveniently be compared in Tigchelaar's table in "The Addressees of *4QInstruction*," in Falk et al., *Sapiential Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 66.

[65] See the discussion against Lange's inconsistent renderings in *DJD XXXIV*, 161.

[66] *DJDXXXIV*, 508.

[67] Ibid., 511. See also the studies cited above in footnote 23.

Of the passages mentioned by Elgvin concerning the "eternal planting," the most strikingly similar to 4Q423 1,2 is that of 1QH^{a} 16: 4–26 (Sukenik col. 8), which also uses the phrase מטעת עולם (line 6) in the context of Edenic imagery. An insightful study of this text has been provided by James R. Davila,[68] who defends a qualified allegorical reading[69] of the hymn and isolates six features within it that may be compared to the fragments under consideration here. The features he notes are as follows:

1. The scene is the Garden of Eden.
2. The narrator is the irrigator of the Garden and thus presumably an Adam figure.
3. The "sprout" or "eternal planting" is the human community of faith residing spiritually in the heavenly temple.[70]
4. Animals and birds represent the human enemies of this sectarian group.
5. The "vigorous mighty ones and blazing fire that turns from side to side" (16:11–12) are angelic beings both in the literal and allegorical sense.
6. The prince (śr) of 16:12 is also an angelic being, this time an interloper potentially hostile to the eternal planting.[71]

The last point is based on Davila's reconstruction of line 12, which is obscured by a lacuna: by comparison with 1Q35, he proposes the reading, "No prince [come]s to the fountain of life." Puech rejects this reconstruction[72] preferring to read זר ("stranger") instead of שר ("prince").[73] Either reconstruction will support the points made below.

---

[68] James R. Davila, "The *Hodayot* Hymnist and the Four who Entered Paradise," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996), 457–78. As the title suggests, the article examines common elements in this account and the story of the four who entered Paradise, a story well represented in both Rabbinic and Hekhalot literature.

[69] His understanding is that the hymn is allegorical but that the angels depicted are both literal and allegorical.

[70] The justification for such a point lies particularly in the use of the term in 1QS 8:4b–10 and 11:5b–9a as well as 4Q418 81 4,11 and 13. In addition, Davila notes the strong connections between the use of the term in both the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 Enoch* 93:3–10; 91:11–17) and CD–A 1:1–8 and a critique of the Second Temple.

[71] Each of these points are expanded by Davila, ibid., 464–71.

[72] Davila ("The *Hodayot* Hymnist," 463) mentions a correspondence with Puech over this matter, in which the latter scholar rejected the reconstruction as "palaeographically impossible."

[73] See "Quelques Aspects de la Restoration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988), 39.

Davila's analysis of the Hodayot text, when brought alongside 4Q423 1,2 as part of a comparative study, flags some interesting issues in the latter text, some of which would be easily missed without such a comparison. First, it is quite clear that Edenic imagery is primary within both scenes. The point needs little defence: in addition to the general setting of 4Q423 1,2 in a garden,[74] vocabulary has been lifted directly from Genesis, notably in line 1 (cf. Gen 2:9), line 2 (cf. Gen 2:15) and line 3, where curse language from Genesis 3:18 is cited verbatim: קוץ ודרדר תצמיח. It is interesting that 1QH^{a} 16:11–12 also employs language associated with the curse (this time from Genesis 3:24): both texts, therefore, play upon the idea of exclusion from the Garden's blessings, although in 4Q423 1,2 such exclusion is depicted as a consequence of the unfaithfulness of the addressee, whereas in 1QH^{a} 16:11–12 it is part of the blanket protection of the Garden from any outsider.

Second, in 4Q423 1,2 the addressee plays a comparable role to the Hodayot hymnist as an Adam figure. The two are not identical: the latter is, as Davila notes, an irrigator, while the former is a farmer (line 2: "to till it and guard it"). Nevertheless, both are presented as Adam figures with responsibility for maintaining the Garden. It is interesting to examine further the irrigation imagery, however. Such imagery is absent from 4Q423 1,2 but does occur in 4Q418 81 (+81a), a fragment that overlaps with 4Q423 8. In line 1 of this fragment, the image of opening a fountain is employed in the context of the addressee's blessing the angels. The verb פתח may be either an imperative or a 3rd. person indicative, the editors favouring the latter. If the verb is an imperative, then there may be some sense in which the addressee is responsible for some kind of metaphorical irrigation; if it is an indicative, then the point of note is that the addressee is the recipient of divine irrigation and that this facilitates his fulfilment of the later imperatives to bless the angels and praise God's name.

Third, heavenly-temple imagery may be crucial to both texts. It is this point that the comparison begins to flag-up some easily overlooked aspects of 4Q423 1,2, for there is no obvious reference to such imagery within it, nor are there any references to angels. Nevertheless, the language of the "planting" here must be set alongside its occurrence in 4Q418 81, where it occurs in line 13, in the context of magnifying God's glory. The previous line includes a reference to "all the Holy Ones," probably designating angels.[75] Earlier in this fragment, there has been

[74] See Elgvin's reconstruction of line 2. *DJD XXXIV*, 508–9.
[75] See *DJD XXXIV*, 308.

a reference to the addressee (possibly as a representative of the believing community) as being appointed "as a Holy of Holies[76] [over all the] earth," followed by the statement that his lot has been cast "among the [Go]dly Ones."[77] The contextual implication would seem to be that the phrase "eternal planting" depicts the community as participating in the angelic reality of the heavenly temple.[78] It may be that Elgvin's statement concerning 4Q423 as a whole—that "these fragments probably derive from a lengthy section of *4QInstruction* which dealt with the life of the farmer,"[79]—should be revisited: perhaps much of the agricultural imagery employed in these fragments represents a play on the Eden/heavenly temple/community complex seen here.

Fourth, as suggested above, the texts diverge over where the threat to the Garden lies: in 1QH[a] 16, the threat comes from outsiders, the animals and birds that represent the human enemies of the community and the possibly angelic/demonic enemy mentioned in line 16. In 4Q423 1,2 the risk is from the addressee himself, whose unfaithfulness causes the earth to bring forth thorns and thistles (line 3).

Two further points arise from this last one. First, the divergence between the two texts suggests that the term "eternal planting" does not have quite the same sectarian edge in 4Q423 as it does in 1QH[a]. The background of the term requires that it denotes a righteous group distinct from the rest of Israel, but the usage here would suggest that a full-blown sectarianism, in which outsiders are villainised simply for being outsiders, is not indicated. This, of course, is consonant with the general understanding of *4QInstruction* as being a pre-sectarian document. Second, the divergence between the two texts draws attention to the fact that, in 4Q423, fidelity to God is key to belonging within the eternal planting. This point will be taken up below, as the creation discourse of 4Q416 1 is studied. At this point it is sufficient to note that the primary stress of the image in 4Q423 1,2 falls on the fidelity of the addressee.

The question that must be raised at this point regards whether this imagery is intended to be understood as a metaphor for the obedi-

---

[76] לקדוש קודשים.

[77] The editors discuss the problems in understanding this phrase, but are fairly confident of their reconstruction.

[78] Loren T. Stuckenbruck makes some interesting observations on possible links between Eden imagery and ideas of angelic fellowship. See "*4QInstruction* and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation," in Hempel et al., *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 245–61.

[79] *DJD*XXXIV, 505.

ence of the remnant community, or as denoting that community's self-perception of its own actual status or nature. To phrase this differently: does the community believe itself to be *like* the original unspoiled Eden in its obedience, or does it perceive itself to be a *new* Eden? Ultimately, a decision on this question requires the additional background provided by the creation discourse at the beginning of the work and the by the admonitory material. I shall, therefore, return to this question below.

Conclusions to Part 1: Eschatology in 4QInstruction

Like the texts that make up *1 Enoch*, *4QInstruction* presents an eschatology that is neither entirely futurist nor entirely realised but rather inaugurated. Moreover, like *1 Enoch*, that inauguration seems to be located around the notion of revealed wisdom, possession of which is characteristic of those belonging to the eschatological community. There are, of course, obvious differences in the nature of that revealed wisdom: in *1 Enoch*, it is based on a specific seer's heavenly journey, while in *4QInstruction* it is independent of such a visionary experience; in *1 Enoch* the narrative demands that the revealing of this wisdom be a future event, while in *4QInstruction* such revelation is clearly assumed to have already taken place.[80] Nevertheless, the texts share an emphasis that wisdom will be revealed to the elect in the last days and that by possession of it, they will be differentiated from those outside their ideological communities.

Also shared is an emphasis on the restoration of creation, but while in *1 Enoch* this idea seems a simple corollary or consequence to the purging of evil that will take place at the judgement, in *4QInstruction* it has (if it is more than just a metaphor) begun to function as a realised aspect of eschatology. Further proof is required to demonstrate this; such proof will be provided below and will further nuance our understanding of how this element of the eschatology of *4QInstruction* relates to its emphasis on revealed wisdom.

Excursus: 4QInstruction *and Mosaic Torah*

A similar picture to that of *1 Enoch* appears in *4QInstruction.* There is a lack of reference to the Torah in this document, too,[81] though such an

[80] See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 52–3.
[81] See *DJD XXXIV*, 27.

omission hardly sets it apart from more traditional or canonical Jewish wisdom works such as Proverbs and Qoheleth.[82] *4QInstruction* does draw upon Pentateuchal traditions, however. 4Q418 103 ii 7–9, for example, seems to draw on Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:9:

> 7. Lest it form something of mixed kinds like a mule, And (lest) thou become as one who we[ars *shaʿaṭnez* (שעטנז)], made of (בד) wool and of flax, And (lest) thy toil be like (that of) one who plo[ughs]
> 8. with ox and a[s]s togeth[er], And (lest) moreover thy crops b[e for thee like] (those of) one who sows diverse kinds, and of one who takes the seed and the full *growth* and the yi[eld of]
> 9. the [vineyard *together*], to be set apa[rt (for the sanctuary).[83]

Similarly, 4Q416 2 iii 18–19 seems to assume the fifth commandment as it urges respect for parents:

> 18. …Honour thou them for the sake of thine own honour And *with* [*reverence*] *venerate* their *persons*,
> 19. For the sake of thy life and of the length of thy days.[84]

The section on marital relations, in 4Q416 2 iii 19–iv 6 also draws on Biblical texts, specifically Genesis 2:24 and 3:16.[85]

Despite the presence of these allusions, it has been argued that *4QInstruction* has a less than favourable attitude towards the Torah. Elgvin, for instance, makes a great deal of 4Q423 3 1–2, in which is found an allusion to Leviticus 26:20:

> 20. And your strength shall be spent in vain (ותם לריק כחכם), for your land shall not yield its increase, and the trees of the land shall not yield their fruit. (Lev 26:20).

4Q423 3 1–2 reads:

---

[82] Sirach, of course, does mention Torah and equates this with wisdom at a number of points, the most celebrated of which is Sirach 24, especially verse 23.

[83] *DJD XXXIV*, 330–31. See G.J. Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation and the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," 208–11, and L. Schiffman, "Halakhic Elements in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," in Collins et al., *Sapiential Perspectives*, 94–99, for a discussion of these verses and the halakhic principles at work. Schiffman also discusses the annulment of vows in 4Q416 2 iv 8–10 (and 4Q418 10 8–10) and the laws of the firstborn in 4Q423 3 4–5).

[84] *DJDXXXIV*, 113.

[85] Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation and the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," 213, discusses the use of Gen 2–3 in 4Q416 2 iii 20–iv 5 as an example of "wisdom as narrative exegesis."

1. And your st]rength (ות]ם) will be s[pent] in va[in] (לריק כו]חכה)
2. By the mystery] (that is) to come. Thus you shall walk, and a[ll your c[rops will multiply.

Elgvin sees here a subversion of Lev 26:20 combined with Lev 26:3, which includes an exhortation to walk according to God's laws; in his view *4QInstruction* replaces this with consideration of רז נהיה, and thus indicates that "true wisdom is not found in the Torah."[86] Goff, however, criticises Elgvin and suggests a rather more subtle relationship:

> 4QInstruction uses the Torah as a source for its teaching, as is evident in 4Q423 3 itself. Its allusion to Leviticus 26 suggests not that the composition displaces Torah wisdom with apocalypticism but that its reception of the Torah is colored by an appeal to revelation beyond that of Sinai.[87]

This seems a more balanced evaluation of the evidence than either Elgvin's or that of Armin Lange, discussed above, which equates רז נהיה with a pre-existent Torah.

It is a clear feature of the work that it is possession of, and allegiance to, רז נהיה that secures eschatological blessing. Only by reflection on רז נהיה can one know properly how to conduct one's daily life. Even if Torah is not rejected, therefore, it still requires to be interpreted in the light of רז נהיה, which is now clearly the real authority. This point is rather neatly illustrated by 4Q416 2 iii 18–19. This may well draw upon the fifth commandment, to honour parents and enjoy long life, but it has re-configured this tradition into a context dominated by the concept of רז נהיה: the parents of the addressee are to be honoured because they have opened his ear to this mystery.

Thus, both *present* faithfulness to God and *future* destiny depend on belonging to the group that has been set apart from the "spirit of flesh" and to whom God has revealed the רז נהיה. Once again, then, inaugurated eschatology seems to be taking on an important function in demarcating the group from the rest of Judaism, even though the text is not a sectarian text as such.

---

[86] Elgvin, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism," 237.
[87] *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 72–3.

Part 2: Form and Ethics in 4QInstruction

If the significance of *1 Enoch* lies in the way in which it testifies to the free blending of sapiential and prophetic forms, the significance of *4QInstruction* lies in the way in which it testifies to the alteration, and (just as important) non-alteration of traditional forms. A brief examination of the material found in the fragments of *4QInstruction* reveals that its paraenetic material comprises primarily admonitions in the second person singular[88] imperative, frequently followed by motive clauses. As such, among Jewish instruction material, it is formally most similar to Proverbs 22:17–24:34[89] and Proverbs 25–27. This biblical material is obviously not eschatological in its content, either in admonitions or in motives,[90] although some sayings would lend themselves to a reappropriation into an eschatological context.[91] It will be illuminating, therefore, to observe the extent to which the inaugurated eschatology of *4QInstruction* has affected this material as our text draws upon these traditional forms and re-appropriates them to its different eschatological context. The admonitions are not the only form used paraenetically in *4QInstruction*, however, and in the following study, considerable space shall also be devoted to a discussion of the creation discourse in 4Q416 1.

While it would be desirable to look in detail at each individual admonition or paraenetic form, this would require a full volume in itself and has, in any case, largely been done by *DJD XXXIV* and by Jefferies' form-critical analysis of the admonitory material.[92] Instead, I shall limit myself to an analysis of the best preserved sections of the work—4Q416, fragments 1 and 2 i–ii and 4Q417, fragments 1 and 2[93]—with only brief comments being made about other parts of the work. For

---

[88] Second person singular addresses characterise *4QInstruction*, with the exception of the section preserved in 4Q418 69, where the addresses are second person plural (though generally not imperatives). Interestingly, this section is largely eschatological in its content.

[89] For a critical discussion of the relationship of Proverbs 22:17–24:22 to the Egyptian *Teaching of Amenemope*, see John Ruffle, "The Teaching of Amenemope and its Connection with the Book of Proverbs," *TynBul* 28 (1977), 29–68.

[90] Von Rad's discussion of these sections, in *Wisdom in Israel* (London: SCM, 1972), 88–91, contains an important discussion of the motive clauses.

[91] For example, Proverbs 23: 10–11, 17–18; 24: 13–14, 19–20.

[92] Daryl F. Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Gorgias Dissertations, Near Eastern Studies 3; New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2002).

[93] These fragments require supplementation in their reconstruction by other fragments, of course.

the purposes of the present study, analysis of these core sections will be sufficient to answer the question of whether the distinctive eschatology of *4QInstruction* has affected the admonitory form; a study of the other sections, while fascinating, would advance our argument little further.

The Creation Discourse as an Ethical Framework

There is now general agreement that 4Q416 1 opens *4QInstruction*. Although Elgvin originally reconstructed the fragments of *4QInstruction* differently,[94] his conclusions were criticised thoroughly by Tigchelaar[95] and he has now, apparently, come to agree with the editors of *DJD XXXIV*.[96] The fragment contains a cosmological discourse discussing the role of the heavenly bodies (lines 1–9) followed by the description of judgement discussed already (10–14) and a reflection upon the nature of God (14b–17). The editors point out that this introduction introduces some of the recurrent terminology of *4QInstruction*[97] as well as noting that:

> Its emphasis on God's sovereignty over the world leads into the hope and expectation of an orderly and just judgement against wickedness and for "all his children" (line 10). This hope is based on the nature of God, for "he is a God of all truth" (line 14).

While there is an obvious distinction in the eschatological dimension, we may nevertheless note some similarity between this and the great wisdom poem in Proverbs 8, where the wisdom employed by God at creation undergirds a sense of moral order in the world.

Tigchelaar, however, has justifiably highlighted the deficiencies of the editors' comments on two levels. First, their comments do not explain how the theology of this section is related to the work as a whole;[98] second, they have wrongly seen the emphasis to fall on God's sovereignty rather than on the obedience of the heavenly bodies.[99] A closer look at the text and at Tigchelaar's discussion of it will demonstrate the value

---

[94] Torleif Elgvin, "An Analysis of *4QInstruction*," diss: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1998, pp. 97–98.

[95] Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar *To Increase Learning*, 181–182.

[96] Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 5–6, indicates that, in a private correspondence, Elgvin made known to him that he had changed his opinion and was now in agreement with the editors.

[97] They single out חפץ (line 2), מחסור (line 6) and יצר בשר (line 16).

[98] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 182.

[99] Ibid., 192–193.

of his criticisms. In order to aid such an examination, it may be helpful to have his translation before us:

1. every spirit [stars of light,]
2. and to mete out the tasks of [they run from eternal time,]
3. season upon season, and [without standing still. Properly they go,]
4. according to their host, to ke[ep station (?), and to for kingdom]
5. and kingdom, for pr[ovince and province, for each and every man,
6. according to the poverty (?) of their host. [And the regulation of them all belongs to Him
7. And the host of heavens He has established ov[er and luminaries]
8. for their portents, and the signs of [their] se[asons
9. one after another. And all their assignments [they] shall [complete, and they shall] count (?) [
10. in heaven He shall pronounce judgement upon the works of wickedness, and all His faithful children will be favourably accepted by [
11. its end. And they shall be in terror. And all who defiled themselves in it, shall cry out. For the heavens shall fear, and the earth too shall be shaken (from its place)]
12. The [s]eas and the depths shall be in terror, and every spirit of flesh will cry out. But the sons of heaven [in the day of]
13. its judgement. And all iniquity shall come to an end, while the period of truth will be completed [
14. in all periods of eternity, for He is a God of truth. And from before the years of [
15. to let the righteous understand (the distinction) between good and evil, to [ ] every regula[tion
16. [incl]ination of the flesh is he/it. And from understanding (?) [
17. His creatures, for [
18. [ ] [[100]

Line 1 introduces us to the "stars of light"[101] that will be the object of the next few lines' discussion. Tigchelaar suggests that there were probably one or two lines of text preceding this one[102] and suggests that such lines may have contained a call to "observe" or "consider," similar to the admonition that introduces the similar section in *1 Enoch* 2–5.[103] The reference to the stars is then followed by a clause that has proved difficult to translate. This clause appears to read ולתכן חפצו which is translated

[100] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 176.

[101] The phrase כוכבי אור is reconstructed from the parallel text 4Q418 229. In lines 1–3, the references to the reconstruction of 4Q416 1 in the following discussion are based on this latter fragment. Thereafter, supplements are mainly from 4Q418 1 and 2.

[102] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 44.

[103] Ibid., 183.

as "will" or "pleasure" by most translators,[104] based on reading the singular form חפץ with the 3 m.s. suffix. Tigchelaar, however, prefers to read חפצי, a construct plural with the meaning "tasks," based on its use in 1QS 3:17 and 1QH 9:15 (Sukenik 1:13). In the photograph, the character does appear to be a *waw*, however the editors discuss the difficulties of distinguishing the two letters in 4Q416,[105] and these difficulties are compounded by a slight crease on the letter's downstroke and by the fact that it occurs on the very edge of the sheet, making a clear observation of the shape of the head of the letter impossible. Tigchelaar's reading is possible, therefore, and it has the advantage of providing a clear hypothetical parallel with the previous clause:

> To establish the paths of the stars of light; and to mete out the tasks of the luminaries.[106]

By contrast, the editors confess that their own translation does not make clear the relation of the individual words in the phrase ולתכן חפצו far less the relation of the phrase to its context.[107]

The rest of line 2, reconstructed on the basis of 4Q418 229, seems to speak of the stars eternally running their course in the heavens, an idea similar to that found in *1 Enoch* 75:8. Line 3 seems to connect this function to the marking of the seasons; the opening clause is מועד במועד. The rest of this line is difficult to reconstruct, but Tigchelaar suggests that the fragment of 4Q418 229 3 could be supplemented to read [ואין להדמות בכו]שר ילכו. His suggestion is that הדמות is a *nip'al, hip'il* or *hitpa'el* of דמה, which occurs in *qal* form in Joshua 10:12–13 where the sun comes to a standstill. Here then, if a negative particle may be read in the first lacuna, it denotes that the heavenly luminaries ceaselessly move as intended. This thought would be supported by his reconstruction of the second lacuna to read בכושר ילכו, "properly they go," a suggestion that Tigchelaar parallels with *1 Enoch* 2:1.[108]

Lines 4–6 contain a number of difficulties, notably how to translate למשור במשורה (line 4) and מחסור צבאם (line 6). Regarding the first, the

---

[104] *DJD XXXIV*, 84 translates as "good pleasure"; Elgvin, "Analysis" page 239, translates "will"; García Martínez/Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill 2000), 847, translate "what he wants."

[105] *DJD XXXIV*, 74.

[106] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 178.

[107] *DJD XXXIV*, 84.

[108] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 178.

editors translate, to "rule by dominion,"[109] while Elgvin translates "hin by hin."[110] Given that the subjects of the clause are the heavenly bodies still in view at the end of the previous line, Tigchelaar suggests that משורה is a variant spelling of מסורה, a form attested in 1QS X 4 and in Aramaic in 4Q204 1 i 19 (4QEn^{c}). There, the meaning seems to be the "relative position of a star in relation to others,"[111] hence Tigchelaar's rendering, "to keep station."[112] Regarding the second phrase, מחסור צבאם, the editors discuss the problem of combining the two elements of "poverty" and "their host," stressing that lines 7 and 8 seem to confirm that צבאם here refers to the heavenly host.[113] Tigchelaar cautiously suggests that there has been an inversion of the letters in מסחור to מחסור. The root סחר in Hebrew and Aramaic is used of the "going around" of merchants, but the Akkadian *saharu* is used of planets and stars. Thus here the term may denote the circuit of the heavenly host.[114] These points are of significance because if Tigchelaar is correct in his suggestions—and they both seem feasible—then we may dispense with three of the suggested meanings for lines 4–5 given by the editors in favour of their fourth, namely that these lines refer "to the heavenly bodies as giving their chronological signs to all lands and peoples."[115]

Line 6 closes with the statement that "the משפט of them all belongs to him." There is general agreement that the reference to "him" is to God, but Tigchelaar differs from the editors in preferring "regulation" as a translation of משפט. Lines 7–9 then take up the thought of the heavenly bodies regulating the seasons, borrowing language from Genesis 1:14. Again, Tigchelaar differs in his rendering of part of verse 9 from the editors: where they take פקודתמה as "their visitation," Tigchelaar prefers "their assignment(s)," based on the following verb being reconstructed as ישל ימו from 4Q418 209 1.[116] He notes the similarity of

---

[109] *DJD XXXIV*, 82. So, too, García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 849.

[110] Elgvin, "Analysis," 239.

[111] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 187.

[112] This is based on taking למשור as an infinitive, hence "to orbit in an orbit" or "to keep station in a station."

[113] *DJD XXXIV*, 84–85.

[114] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 179.

[115] *DJD XXXIV*, 84. The other suggestions are that the lines refer i) to God's law being binding on all people ii) to the instruction to the maven being so binding or iii) to God's blessing being universal. The bracketing of these lines with references to the role of the heavenly host would seem to militate against such readings.

[116] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 179. Cf. Elgvin's translation, "their order," ("Analysis," 239, 242).

this phrase, "They will complete their assignments," with the Ethiopic of *1 Enoch* 5:3.[117]

The stress on the fidelity of the heavenly bodies that Tigchelaar has isolated and highlighted is indeed reminiscent of *1 Enoch* 2–5. As it does there, the material here leads into a discussion of the judgement and destruction of wickedness (lines 10–14). It should not be overlooked that the righteous are described as "his faithful children" (line 10: בני אמתו), with the implication that those who were "defiled in it" (wickedness, that is; line 11) were unfaithful; that is, their sin comprised *infidelity.* We have, then, a suggestion that the cosmological section serves a paraenetic function, teaching that fidelity to God involves emulating the fidelity of the heavenly bodies by properly obeying one's appointed tasks in life.

This suggestion of a paraenetic function may be reinforced by lines 14 and 15, depending on how one takes the variant in line 15. These verses are difficult to reconstruct; on the basis of 4Q418 2, line 14 can be reconstructed as beginning with a reference to all the periods of eternity, followed by the statement that God is "the God of Truth", or "fidelity" (אמת). This is followed by the statement "and from before the years of [" followed by a lacuna. Line 15 then opens with the textual variant: 4Q416 has להכון צדק בין טוב לרע while 4Q418* 2 has להבין צדק for the first two words. The editors discuss the possible interpretations:

> There are two possible readings: (a) 'for the righteous to distinguish/to understand the difference between (להבין) good and evil' (or even 'for Him [i.e. God] to make the righteous understand…') thus 4Q418 and (b) 'to establish (להכין) a right measure between good and evil' (4Q416) or even (b) 'for a right measure to be established (*Nip'al* להכון) between good and evil'. The former (*lectio facilior*) uses an idiom frequent in Biblical and Qumran Hebrew.[118]

Elgvin follows the second of the editors' interpretations, but the editors prefer the former. Tigchelaar agrees, but draws in further material from 4Q418 221 and 222 to suggest that the subject of the infinitive is not God but the sage.[119] The argument is interesting, but ultimately speculative. However, Tigchelaar's suggested reconstruction of the lacuna is interesting:

---

[117] This phrase is not found in the Aramaic fragments. The Ethiopic is *gĕbĕrōmū*; Dillmann (*Lexicon Linguae Ethiopicae cum Indice Latino* [repr. New York: Ungar, 1955], 1163) lists this verse under the meaning "*labor, operatio, opera, opus.*"

[118] *DJD XXXIV* 87–88.

[119] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 188.

> For He is a God of truth, and from before the years of [old He has opened up (for…) understanding and insigh]t, to make the righteous understand…[120]

The central point of this is that the text seems to be stressing that the righteous are brought to understand the difference between good and evil. In a text that has begun with a lengthy consideration of the fidelity of the heavenly bodies and of the deliverance of the "faithful children", the notion of fidelity would appear to be the pre-eminent feature of this difference, with the cosmological discourse thus serving a paraenetic function, a function in keeping with Jewish thought.[121] Tigchelaar concludes:

> The emphasis is not on God's orderly rule, but on the heavenly bodies' obedience: in accordance with their determined tasks they run their courses. This topic is common in Early Jewish literature, **but whereas in other texts the simile is used in a more general sense (nature obeys God's laws, so you should too), *Instruction* stresses in its other parts that every living being has been allotted his or its own position in life and tasks.**[122]

Several points are of enormous significance here. First, the cosmological and eschatological elements cannot be separated: the description of judgement is connected fundamentally to the cosmological discussion both structurally and conceptually. Whether the addressee has or has not emulated the fidelity of the heavenly bodies determines how he will be judged. Second, despite this futurist eschatological perspective, there is no sense of an *Interimethik* that replaces older law: the whole image requires the sense that ethics are about fulfilling God's appointed tasks within his creation, i.e. living in true fidelity with his will as Creator. Third, the righteous are those who should be able to behave with the same fidelity as the heavenly bodies, precisely because they have been enabled to distinguish between good and evil, a point that highlights the role of the inaugurated eschatology we have discussed previously, and specifically the notion of revealed wisdom that seems so central to that eschatology. Indeed, on this last point, it would be of no surprise if the

---

[120] Ibid., 190.

[121] See M.E. Stone, "The Parabolic Use of Natural Order in Judaism of the Second Temple Age" in *Gilgul: Essays on Transformation, Revolution and Permanence in the History of Religions. Dedicated to R.J. Zwi Werblowsky* (ed. S. Shaked, D. Shulman, G.G. Stroumsa; SHR 50; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 298–308.

[122] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 193. Emphasis mine.

lacuna at the end of line 14 contained some reference to the רז נהיה that we have seen to be so important.[123]

The presence of the creation discourse and eschatological material at the beginning of the work clearly establishes an eschatological and ethical framework in which the rest of the work is to be understood.[124] In particular, this emphasises that the overarching concern of the text is to enable one to emulate the heavenly bodies by fulfilling one's allotted role or position within creation and thus to be delivered from the coming judgement or to be judged favourably.

Admonitions in 4QInstruction

Having examined the framework provided by the introductory discourse, we may now examine the admonitory material. As mentioned already, among Jewish instruction material, the admonitions of *4QInstruction* are formally most similar to Proverbs 22:17–24:34 and Proverbs 25–27. Often in *4QInstruction*, the admonitions are introduced with the formula, ואתה מבין, (sometimes ואתה בן מבין), probably best translated, "and you, understanding one."[125] This phrase seems to take the place of the "my son" address common in such instructions. As with Proverbs 22:17–24: 34 or Proverbs 25–27, the admonitions cover an extensive range of life situations from family life, agriculture and financial matters to courtly concerns, both royal and legal. Linking this range of subject matter to the introduction that we have just studied, Tigchelaar comments:

> The admonitory sections lay down rules of behaviour befitting to persons in specific trades or social positions, whereas the cosmological or eschatological sections emphasise the general principle that everything has its own rules by which it should abide.[126]

The question we must ask regards whether the content of the admonitions, either in their imperatives or in their motives, has been affected by the eschatology of *4QInstruction.* Do they differ, in this respect, from the

---

[123] This would sit happily with Tigchelaar's reconstruction of the lacuna.

[124] As Harrington notes, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran.* (London: Routledge 1996), 41.

[125] Note, however, that Lange, *Weisheit*, 52–53, translates the phrase variously as vocatives ("Du Lehrer" in 4Q418 123 ii 5, page 56), indicatives ("Du bist Ratgeber," 4Q417 1 i 1, page 52), and sometimes as part of the argument ("und du wirst einsehen" 4Q417 1 i 13–14, page 53). Note the criticisms of Lange's inconsistent rendering of this phrase in *DJD XXXIV*, 161.

[126] Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 248.

non-eschatological material found in the Proverbs passages listed above? In order to address this question, the admonitions found in 4Q416 1&2 and 4Q417 1&2[127] shall be grouped into three categories: eschatological admonitions in which the command itself is eschatological in nature; admonitions with eschatological motives; and admonitions with no obvious eschatological signatures.

1. *Eschatological Admonitions*

A number of times, the understanding one is enjoined to "gaze upon רז נהיה." Bearing in mind our earlier discussion of this phrase, such admonitions carry clear eschatological connotations. Perhaps the most striking is found in 4Q417 2 i 10–12:

> Gaze upon רז נהיה and grasp[128] the birth-times (מולדי)[129] of salvation. And know who is to inherit glory and toil. Has not [rejoicing been appointed for the contrite of spirit] and for those among them who mourn, eternal joy.[130]

Here, three admonitions are presented in parallel, the latter two reinforcing the sense of the first as being eschatological. The rhetorical question that follows takes the place of the motive clause and presents the eschatological reversal of circumstances as an encouragement to the addressee. This admonition is all the more striking because it is embedded in a block of admonitions that are concerned with more mundane matters, a block to which we shall return later.

Although less striking, the large block of material in 4Q417 1 i is still impressive in its sustained argument for the importance of considering רז נהיה. Much of this text is fragmentary, but it may be fairly confidently supplemented with the fragments 4Q418 43, 44, 45 and 4Q418a. After

---

[127] I have chosen to limit the discussion to these fragments in order to allow a sufficiently thorough examination of the material. Obviously it would be desirable to examine all of the admonitions, but this would require more space than can be justified here. The points that will be made are demonstrated sufficiently by the material found within these fragments.

[128] Translating קח as being from לקח. The editors discuss the justification for their translation "to understand" in *DJD XXXIV*, 182.

[129] See Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Tahmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature: With an Index of Scriptural Quotations* (New York: E. Shapiro, 1926), 742.

[130] See the discussion of the reconstruction of the lacuna in *DJD XXXIV*, 182, where the editors give four possibilities. I have followed this particular reconstruction as the chiasm of "rejoicing . . . contrite in heart; those who mourn . . . joy" seems appropriate.

the standard address to the understanding one, lines 2 and 3 call the addressee to gaze upon and ponder "the wondrous mysteries of the God of the Awesome Ones" and רז נהיה. Lines 3 and 4 follow the last admonition with] ומעשי קדם למה נהיה ומה נהיה במה. The combination of tenses and particles here is difficult to identify: the editors suggest that "the works of old" is followed by a temporal sequence reading "what is to come, for what purpose it is to come, in what circumstances it is to come."[131] Harrington, in his own later work, prefers to see it as a reference to a knowledge of past, present and future: "[…] of old to what is and what is to be, in what […]"[132] It seems, at least, that some consideration of the future is being urged.

Line 6 is reminiscent of Psalm 1:2 in its language of meditating day and night upon רז נהיה.[133] A continual study of this will enable the addressee to know "truth and iniquity, wisdom and foolishness."[134] Line 7 then takes up this *two-ways* imagery and speaks of the eschatological punishment that is to come (פקודת עד) before line 8 resumes the idea of the addressee discerning between good and evil, where this time the focus is on "their deeds."

Lines 8c–12 then provide a theological foundation for these claims regarding the value of pondering רז נהיה: the God of knowledge is the foundation of truth (סוד אמת)[135] and by the same רז נהיה that is now being pondered, God has ordered the world.[136] This point is very significant because it draws together the notion of a wisdom that must be revealed, characteristic of *4QInstruction* and *1 Enoch*, as we have seen, with the traditional notion of a wisdom that is immanent in creation and

---

[131] *DJD XXXIV* 157. cf. Lange's "Urzeit, warum etwas ensteht und was ensteht." *Weisheit*, 52.

[132] D.J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. Translation on page 52, comments on page 54.

[133] In Psalm 1, of course, the reference is to God's law.

[134] This point reinforces our earlier suggestion that some reference to רז נהיה may have been in the lacuna in 4Q416 line 14. Note the similar vocabulary in both texts.

[135] See the discussion of this phrase in *DJD XXXIV*, 158.

[136] Note the *DJD XXXIV* discussion of these verses, 158. The sense of the verses is difficult, and made more so by a large wear pattern on the manuscript, but it seems to indicate that רז נהיה functions as a kind of underlying order, governing truth and its deeds. Elgvin, "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic," in Falk, Martinez and Schuller, *Sapiential Texts*, 24–25 prefers to read these verses as relating to creation, but the only noun that can provide an antecedent to the suffixes on אוש (foundation) and מעשים (deeds) is אמת. Nevertheless, the similarity to Proverbs 8:23–31 that Elgvin notes is striking and it may be that the text is bringing together the idea of Wisdom being the underlying order of creation, as Proverbs 8 presents it, with the idea of רז נהיה being the underlying order of truth, and thus the true underlying principle of creation.

that undergirds the moral order. Wisdom here still undergirds creation and the moral order, but it is a wisdom that requires to be revealed. The fact that this very same Wisdom will also play its role in the judgement that is to come draws creation and eschatology together under the one unifying concept.

Line 12 resumes the admonition: the addressee is to investigate these things carefully.[137] Lines 14–16 introduce a parallel admonition to consider the preordained future,[138] which leads into a discussion of the contrast between the spiritual people who possess the Book of הגי/הגו, and the spirit of flesh, discussed above. This point serves as a negative parallel to line 8: here, the spirit of flesh cannot discern between good and evil.

All of this builds up to another admonition to gaze on רז נהיה in line 18. This time, the admonition is paralleled by the phrase "and know [the paths of] everyone that lives and the manner of his walking that is appointed for his deeds." It is striking that these eschatological admonitions have here reached a point where they serve a paraenetic function closely linked to the purpose of the creation discourse in 4Q416 1.

2. *Admonitions with Eschatological Motives*

After the eschatological admonitions discussed above, 4Q417 1 i line 23 urges the addressee to "act with strength"[139] and to "not be contaminated[140] by evildoing." The beginning of the motive clause requires some reconstruction[141] but most of the clause is clear: the one who is contaminated "will not be held innocent (לא ינקה)." This statement is made thoroughly eschatological by the following clause which says that "according to his inheritance (נחלתו) he will be declared guilty."[142]

---

[137] The verb is דרש which carries such a sense of careful enquiry. See *BDB*, 205 (meaning 7), also R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer and B.A. Waltke, *A Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1980), 198.

[138] These lines contain a number of problems, such as the meaning of רוש פעל תצה in line 14 (regarding which, see *DJD XXXIV*, 161–162), the question of the meaning of "the children of שות" in line 15 (regarding which, see Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 55) and the reference to the book of הגי/הגו in line 16, (regarding which, see my discussion in chapter 2).

[139] *Hitpa'el* imperative of חזק.

[140] The verb is תוגע which the editors (*DJD XXXIV* 167) suggest is best read as a passive of נגע followed by an instrumental *bet*, with the meaning "do not be contaminated by."

[141] See *DJD XXXIV*, 167.

[142] Assuming the reconstructed verb at the end of line 24 to be the *hip'il* of רשע.

In the context of the preceding lines 1–22, such a statement carries the clear connotation of future judgement. Thus, we have non-eschatological admonitions ("Act with strength…Do not be contaminated") followed by eschatological motive clauses anticipating judgement.

A more subtle example of eschatological motivation is found in 4Q417 2 i 2–7. Here, the reader is enjoined to forgive the noble[143] without reproach, an admonition followed by an uncertain clause that may refer to someone who is either bound or bewitched.[144] In either case, the reader[145] is in the position of having to address this person. Line 3 warns the reader not to confound[146] his addressee's spirit, a command followed by what appears to be an obscure motive clause translated by the editors as "for in silence (calmness) thou hast spoken."[147] Although generally כיא introduces motive clauses in *4QInstruction*, this hemistich may make more sense if it is taken as introducing a causal clause: "*because* בדממה you have spoken." It may be that a more appropriate rendering of בדממה is "in a whisper," a reading that takes into account the way the noun is used in 1 Kings 19:12. If this reading is correct, and if we perhaps read וגם as an emphatic "but," then the line might read:

> But do not confound his spirit because you have spoken in a whisper [ ]

Such a reading would explain the seeming contradiction of lines 2 and 4; the reader is instructed not to reproach the noble, but in doing so, he is not to confound him by remaining silent or mumbling a rebuke. Instead, as line 4 takes up the thought, the reader is to "make haste to recount a rebuke," but to do so humbly, aware of his own sins: "But do not overlook your own sins." The lacuna which follows this last admonition almost certainly contains a reference to God[148] so that he is the subject of יצדק.[149] Thus, line 5 opens, "he (God) will declare [object] righteous, just like you." With the strong possibility that there is a reference to forgiveness in the lacuna at the end of this line, so that line 5 ends

---

[143] The precise meaning of הכשר is unclear in Qumran Hebrew.

[144] See *DJD XXXIV*, 178.

[145] I shall use the term "reader" throughout this section in order to avoid confusion with the reader's own addressee.

[146] Another difficult term: see *DJD XXXIV*, 178.

[147] It is not clear how this motive clause would function. The editors (*DJD XXXIV*, 179) discuss several options none of which clarify matters greatly.

[148] Note the comments in *DJD XXXIV*, 179.

[149] The editors argue that this should be taken as a declaratory *pi'el* form. The pronoun הואה they take to be subjective, relating back to the occurrence of "God" or equivalent in the lacuna.

"with…forgiveness] will he work,"[150] we have here a flow of thought that either indicates that God will forgive the sinner as much as he has forgiven the reader, or that he will forgive the sinner as much as the reader has forgiven them.[151] In either case, the logic is that the reader's behaviour is to take into account the forgiveness and justification he has already received, that are connected to his eschatological future, and to behave towards his addressee in a way that acknowledges that this person too may receive such forgiveness. The eschatological dimension of this becomes clearer when we appreciate that the implied analogy is between God as judge, an eschatological notion in *4QInstruction*,[152] and the reader as judge. Indeed, this point emerges further in the admonition that begins in the second half of line 13, where the reader is to pronounce his judgements like (or "as") a righteous ruler. Again, he is not to overlook his own sins (line 14) and is to be humble. Verses 15 and 16 then take up judgement language using theophanic imagery to speak of God's anger before concluding with the questions, "Who will be declared righteous when he gives judgement? And without forgiveness how can any man stand before him?"[153] The logic is parallel to the admonitions discussed above: again, the reader is urged to judge in the knowledge that he himself will be declared righteous only by God's gracious forgiveness. Thus again, the eschatological judgement motivates and shapes present behaviour in a way that is more subtle than merely warning the reader to be righteous because of the prospect of judgement.[154]

3. *Admonitions with No Eschatological Signatures*

Immediately after the section discussed above in 4Q417 2 i, the text contains a series of admonitions regarding food, poverty and finance (lines 17–28). Neither the admonitions nor the motive clauses are eschatological. Line 17 contains the admonition to gather "surpluses" (מותריכה, cf. the use of the noun in Proverbs 14:23 and 21:5) for the

---

[150] Line 5 and first word of line 6. See *DJD XXXIV*, 179.

[151] Both options are discussed by ibid., 179. The editors note the similarity of the latter possibility with Matthew 6:12.

[152] See 4Q416 1, lines 10ff.

[153] The last clause is fragmentary. See *DJD XXXIV*, 185.

[154] Further examples in which the eschatological future plays a role in motivating behaviour are found in the admonitions concerning poverty. See the discussions in Catherine M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 163–209 and Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 206–214.

provision of those that lack in their poverty.[155] The line is interesting because the reconstruction from 4Q418 64 contains the only occurrence of יחד in *4QInstruction.* Given the lack of distinctively Qumran vocabulary in *4QInstruction*, however, the term should simply be treated as "community" generally, or even as having adverbial force: "together." Line 18 then enjoins the poor one to take what he needs from this collection without payment. The series of admonitions is then followed by an explanatory clause: "for your/his treasure house [God][156] will not make to be lacking in anything . . . [According] to his command will everything come into being (כול יהיה)." This motive clause is intriguingly subtle: it may refer to the poor one, providing consolation that his need will be met by God the Creator; or it may refer to the giver of surplus, stressing that to give is not to impoverish one's own storehouse, for God will ensure that it does not lack anything. In either case, the basis of the clause is the same: God is the Creator and Provider.[157]

This series of admonitions flows naturally into the warning in line 20 against gluttony (already the reader has been warned to take no more than his share from the collection in line 18). This warning is motivated by a פן-clause: "lest by gluttony you shorten your life." It is striking that the consequence in view is not an eschatological one. Similarly, the following admonitions on financial matters all lack eschatological motives.

4Q416 2 ii 3ff., which would have probably occurred after the texts discussed above in *4QInstruction*, contain some interesting material discussing financial matters further. The discussion in lines 3–6 about repayment leads in to an admonition not to exchange[158] one's holy spirit (רוח קדשכה) for any price. The motive clause reads: "for no price is equal in value to it." The reference is probably to selling oneself into slavery and seems to be paralleled by line 17: "Do not sell yourself (נפשכה) for a

---

[155] The line actually begins with an address to the poor, but the admonition in line 17 is aimed at those with surplus food. The next line then reverts to the poor one as addressee.

[156] The editors are surely correct that there must have been a reference to God somewhere in the lacuna at the end of 19 that provided the subject for the 3m.s. verbs. *DJD XXXIV* 187.

[157] A very similar block of material occurs in 4Q416 2 i:21–ii:3, where again the subject matter is the provision of food, and again the emphasis falls on the nature of God as the Provider.

[158] For this verb, תמר, and the potential variants see *DJD XXXIV*, 98. The editors are probably correct in seeing מור as the root, based on the context of financial exchange.

price." In neither of these admonitions is there any indication of eschatological motivation; even the reference to pledging one's inheritance as surety (line 18) that parallels the admonition in line 17[159] cannot be taken in any eschatological sense; instead it seems to be recognising the risk of losing one's inheritance through a pledge and then being forced into slavery, thus also losing ownership of one's own body. The rest of the column, which continues to discuss appropriate behaviour in poverty, finishing with the treatment of one's wife,[160] likewise contains no eschatological motives for its admonitions.

The point that arises from this discussion is that while the prospect of future judgement may function as a motive for right living, it is not the sole or even primary such motive. Many of the motive clauses simply relate to the world in which the addressee lives. The point may be developed by noting three points where Creation-patterns connected to the introductory discourse in 4Q416 1 form the basis for a particular admonition.

In 4Q416 2 iii 8, in the midst of a series of admonitions dealing with poverty, the impoverished addressee is warned not to desire anything beyond his "inheritance" (נחלתכה) and not to be consumed[161] by it, "lest you displace your boundary (גבולכה)." The *DJD XXXIV* editors recognise that in its use of this latter phrase, the text is drawing upon Deut 19:14 and 27:17, noting that the references in these verses to the shifting of boundary-markers are sometimes taken up with a metaphorical sense in sapiential contexts to refer to transgression or neglect of the Law.[162] The editors struggle, however, to make sense of the use of the phrase here. When understood against the background of Tigchelaar's discussion of 4Q416 1, though, the phrase makes perfect sense. It will be recalled that the introductory discourse of this fragment teaches that each creature has its own allotted role and position in life. The language here of "boundaries" seems conceptually connected with this: for the poor addressee to strive for more than he has been allotted is to

---

[159] *DJD XXXIV*, 93 translates "For [no] price [s]ell thy glory, Or pledge money for thy inheritance (?), Lest it (the money?) dispossess also thy body." See also their discussion, 106.

[160] The terminology referring to the wife has often been discussed as a background to Paul's language in 1 Thessalonians 4:4. See the discussion in *DJD XXXIV* 109–10 and Elgvin, "To Master his own Vessel: 1 Thess 4:4 in the Light of New Qumran Evidence," *NTS* 43 (1997) 604–619.

[161] Following García Martínez/Tigchelaar *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, for the sense of בלע against *DJD XXXIV*, 116, where the verb is read as "confuse."

[162] *DJD XXXIV*, 116.

risk shifting his boundary and thus breaking fidelity with his Creator's will. Such an understanding of the admonition is connected logically with the following lines (9–12), in which the possibility of the addressee being elevated to a higher position by God[163] is discussed. It is interesting that the editors suggest that the meaning of נחלה, which occurs in lines 8, 10 and 11, is consistently that of "allotted station." All of this points towards this whole discussion of poverty being grounded in the creation-theology of the introductory discourse.

The second example of a creation-pattern is more problematic, but nevertheless worth noting. In 416 2 iii, lines 15–19, there is found an admonition to honour one's parents even when in a situation of poverty. The text suggests that parents are to be honoured because their relationship to the addressee is comparable to that of God.[164] The specific point of comparison is that of the role played in the "creation" of the addressee by his parents: according to the most likely translation of כור הוריכה they are "the oven of your origin."[165] This phrase is very problematic,[166] but if הוריכה is understood as being derived from הרה,[167] all of the options for understanding it carry the sense that the parents are compared to God the Creator as the (lesser) "creators" of the addressee. The addressee is therefore to "serve" them (line 17) as man is to serve the Creator God, a subordination grounded in Creation itself. It is striking that such an attitude is presented in lines 17–18 as being required of the addressee because of the possession and understanding of רז נהיה. The editors suggest that the verb גלה ("opened") should be emended to its 3rd. plural form גלו so that the parents are the ones who have opened the addressee's ear to the mystery.[168] I am less convinced than the editors that such an alteration is necessary in the

---

[163] Note the editors' discussion of the alternation of singular/plural forms of השיבכה between 4Q416 and the parallel fragment of 4Q418.

[164] See *DJD XXXIV* 120–1. The first reference is to the father as being כאב ("as a father"), although the editors argue that the parallel reading in 418, כאל, fits the context best. The second is to the mother being כאדנים ("as the Lord/a master"). The editors argue for the latter term being a reference to God.

[165] García Martínez/Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* 2:853.

[166] See *DJD XXXIV*, 121.

[167] The other possible option, not mentioned by the editors, is to see the word as being derived from ירא/ירה, "to teach," so that the parents are the "oven of your instruction." This is attractive and circumvents the problems discussed by the editors, but it is difficult to see how such a reading would fit the context. The similarity of the phrase here with 1QH III may also point us in the direction of the reading adopted by the editors.

[168] *DJD XXXIV*, 122.

context and prefer to see God as the agent, but regardless of this issue, the text makes a close link between possession and understanding of רז נהיה and ability to fulfil the creation pattern.

The third example is found in 416 2 iv, where there is a discussion concerning the authority of the addressee over his wife. The text seems to be concerned with maintaining appropriate patterns of submission, so that each man has authority only over his own wife. As with the discussion of poverty in 4Q416 2 iii 8, the notion of allotted positions and roles underlies the admonition: any man who attempts to have dominion over a woman other than his own wife has "displaced the boundary of his life" (line 6). The important point for our argument is that the basis of the argument is the creation story; the passage begins with a quote from Gen 2:24 ("For this reason a man will leave his father and mother, cleave to his wife and the two shall become one flesh.") and thereafter is full of allusions to Genesis 2–3: "he has given you dominion over her," (Gen 3:16), "he has separated her from her mother," (Gen 2:24) "[she shall be] for you, to be one flesh," (Gen 2:24). Yet the Genesis allusions are fused with the concern of the creation discourse in 4Q416 1 that each creature has its allotted role and that the boundaries of these allotments are not shifted.

These examples demonstrate that alongside the prospect of future judgement, *4QInstruction* makes use of patterns within the creation, drawn from the creation discourse of 4Q416 1, as a basis for right living. The question may now be asked as to whether these two elements are simply distinct motivating factors in the ethics of *4QInstruction* or whether there exists a more subtle relationship between them. In order to do this, the relationship between creation, eschatology and ethics in *4QInstruction* must be examined more closely. In particular, we will return to the phrase רז נהיה, which I will suggest is crucial to the interface between the three.

Creation, Eschatology and Ethics: Clarifying the Interface

We have already seen that obedience is presented, in *4QInstruction*, as fulfilling one's allotted role within creation. The text seems to present רז נהיה as being necessary to such obedience, a fact that emerges particularly in 417 1 i (supplemented by 418 fragments 43–45). We have examined this text already, but a closer reading is now required.

Lines 8–13 of 417 1 i develop the theme of reflecting on רז נהיה that is the subject of lines 1–7. The section begins part-way through line 8

with a reference to God as the "foundation of truth,"[169] a reference that is immediately followed by a description of that truth being constructed upon רז נהיה:

> And by/on רז נהיה he has laid out/expounded[170] its (truth's)[171] foundation, and its deeds [he has prepared with all wisdom].[172]

The following lines develop this idea of the construction of truth using language that seems deliberately to employ the vocabulary of creation: מעשיה ("deeds/acts/creatures" + suffix) occurs twice in line 9 and once in line 10; יצרה ("he fashioned it") occurs in verse 9; תוצאותמה ("origins"[173] + 3pl suffix) occurs in 13 as does גבורות מעשיו ("his mighty works/acts").

I would suggest that this use of creation-vocabulary seems to be intended to identify רז נהיה as the foundation of the truth that undergirds and orders all creation, a role often played by Wisdom in Jewish thought.[174] The community that possesses and reflects upon רז נהיה is therefore able to understand creation in a way that those outside that community can never share.[175] This becomes the basis for the fidelity of the community to their allotted role within creation, a fact that emerges from lines 10–12 of 417 1 i: man is intended to know these things "together with how he should walk perfect in all his actions" (line 12). This crucial step allows us to bring together Tigchelaar's discussion of the creation discourse in 4Q416, which opens *4QInstruction*, with the centrality of the concept of רז נהיה to the work as a whole.[176] It

---

[169] סוד אמת. For a discussion of this phrase, see *DJD XXXIV*, 158.

[170] The editors discuss the various options for פרש, *DJD XXXIV*, 158.

[171] Again, see *DJD XXXIV*, 158 for the justification of seeing אמת as the referent of the female suffixes.

[172] The last clause is reconstructed from the fragments of 4Q418.

[173] This may be translated as "outcomes" or "origins", the editors (*DJD XXXIV*, 160) favouring the former. The context does not particularly help in deciding which should be followed as it is preceded by creation vocabulary and followed by eschatological vocabulary. I would prefer to read this as indicating origin rather than outcome, but my case hardly rests upon this one word.

[174] See the discussion of how this relates to the description of Wisdom in Proverbs 3:19 in Goff, *Wordly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 61–66, Elgvin, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism," 235, Lange, *Weisheit*, 40–62.

[175] It is interesting to note that the passage discussed above in 416 2 iii, speaking of honouring parents, precedes a final admonition to honour them with the words, "and since he has opened your ears to/by (ב) רז נהיה," The point would seem to be that the addressee is able to honour them according to the creation pattern because his ears have been opened to or (more likely) by רז נהיה.

[176] The point I am highlighting is consonant with the recent work of Goff, *Wordly and*

also allows us to return to the question of whether the Eden imagery in 4Q423 1,2 is metaphorical or not: in a text in which a return to a state of fidelity to creation patterns is the ultimate goal, a return made possible by the eschatological possession of רז נהיה, it is reasonable to regard the Eden imagery as depicting the ideological community's actual perception of itself as a restored creation or, to use language that is more faithful to *4QInstruction*'s own categories of obedience and sin,[177] as an Edenic oasis of order in the midst of a world tainted by the spirit of flesh, in which the boundaries have all been shifted.

Structural Observations

Before drawing some conclusions, three observations regarding the structure of the work are in order:

First, the presence of the creation discourse and eschatological material at the beginning of the work clearly establishes an eschatological framework in which the rest of the work is to be understood,[178] a point that may be developed by noting that, in addition, the first block of admonitions are those we classed as eschatological admonitions.

Second, eschatological admonitions and material often surface within less eschatological material (for example 4Q417 2 i 11); there is no sense that such material should be neatly compartmentalised or that there is a problem with breaking the flow of a non-eschatological section with an eschatological reflection or admonition. The fragment 4Q418 69 may also be noted in this respect: its eschatological discourse, clearly framed in dualistic terms, appears in the middle of otherwise non-eschatological second person singular admonitions. The sensibilities of modern scholars examining apocalyptic/sapiential redaction in Q would doubtless be greatly offended by a work like this.

Third, while there is a loose structuring of admonitions according to content, this is very loose; often admonitions that are linked thematically are not grouped together but are separated by other material.

Heavenly Wisdom, who never seems, however, to make explicit this connection between creation, eschatology and fidelity.

[177] The language of "restored creation" may not be ideal, as it may be suggestive of the idea of a Fall. This idea is not necessarily found within *4QInstruction*, as Collins notes in "The Mysteries of God," 302.

[178] As Harrington notes, *Wisdom Texts*, 41.

Conclusions to Part 2: Form and Ethics in 4QInstruction

On the strength of the analysis above, several important conclusions may be reached:

1. While the paraenetic material is clearly found in an eschatological context, the concept of ethics is related to creation. *4QInstruction* clearly looks forward to a future judgement at which will be seen a dualism between the "the foolish" and "the wise." The wisdom of the latter group arises from their possession of רז נהיה, a wisdom revealed by God in "the birth times of salvation" that enables the addressee, and the group to which he belongs, to live according to the design plan of the Creator-God. רז נהיה is capable of such an effect because it itself is the underlying principle of all creation, this role being comparable to that played by "Wisdom" in much Jewish literature. As a consequence of the possession of this revealed wisdom, the addressee is enabled to emulate the fidelity of the heavenly bodies to their allotted role within creation and thus to be judged favourably.
2. While obviously eschatological considerations can function as motives for right living, so too can seemingly non-eschatological motives. Within an eschatology that understands the remnant to be a new creation and perceives ethics to be a matter of returning to a state of fidelity to creation, we may have to broaden the category of what is understood to be "eschatological." The use of patterns within creation as a basis for right living may not at first seem to be an eschatological idea, but within the schema discussed above it can, in fact, be regarded as such.
3. Obviously eschatological and seemingly non-eschatological admonitions can exist side by side in the same work. This need not reflect careless redaction, but rather the kind of "restored-creation" eschatology that has been seen to undergird the text.
4. The fact that the underlying order of creation cannot be grasped by reflection but must be revealed may help to explain why *4QInstruction* is characterised by admonitions and not proverbs, the latter form indicating truths that are self-evident or that have been distilled by meditation.

Excursus: The Restored Glory of Adam

The concepts that have been identified in both of the texts studied so far, but especially in *4QInstruction*, seem fairly closely related to an idea found elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, that to those who belong to the elect remnant, the glory lost by Adam is restored. Alexander Golitzin has examined this idea in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Syriac Christian mystical writings from the 4th century,[179] noting the presence in each group of texts of a cluster of ideas associated with Adamic glory. These ideas include the restoration of the divine glory, the fellowship of the redeemed with the angels, the bestowal of garments of glory or light and the vision of the divine glory. Some citations from the Rule of the Community (1QS) may help to illustrate how they operate:

> These are the counsels of the spirit for the sons of truth in the world. And the visitation of those who walk in it will be for healing, plentiful peace in a long life, fruitful offspring with all everlasting blessings, eternal enjoyment with endless life, and a crown of glory with majestic raiment in eternal light. (1QS IV 6–8)
>
> In this way the upright will understand knowledge of the Most High, and the wisdom of the sons of heaven will teach those of perfect behaviour. For these are those selected by God for an everlasting covenant and to them shall belong all the glory of Adam. (1QS IV 22–23)[180]

Such language and imagery is frequent in the Scrolls and in the Syriac writings. A key point in Golitzin's argument is that this cluster of ideas related to the glory of Adam was mediated to Syriac circles not by Christian transmission but by common Semitic culture.

A similar argument has been made by Crispin Fletcher-Louis,[181] who has made a more extensive examination of the subject within the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature. His study essentially proposes that a thoroughgoing "angelomorphism" is operative in many of the Dead Sea Scrolls, particularly in liturgical contexts, in which the members of the community are transformed into angelic figures and are, essentially,

---

[179] See Alexander Golitzin, "Recovering the 'Glory of Adam': 'Divine Light' Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls Present and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*, edited by James R. Davila, (STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 275–308.

[180] Translation taken from F. García Martínez *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts Translated* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; 2nd Ed.; Brill: Leiden, 1996), 6–7.

[181] C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

divinised. Carol Newsom's review of Fletcher-Louis' work makes two telling criticisms: first, that he is guilty of seeing his favourite topic under every stone that he turns and, second, that his appreciation of language is rather flat, incapable of dealing with the colourful metaphors often used in literary contexts that are not intended to be taken literally, as Fletcher-Louis seems to do.[182] Nevertheless, these criticisms do not take away from the fact that he has identified just how prevalent the notion of "glory" is in the Scrolls and how, in many cases, this glory seems to be presented using Edenic imagery. The findings of this, and the last, chapter, then, are not concerned with an idea that emerges only in *4QInstruction*, but rather with an idea fairly well attested in the Scrolls and in Semitic-Christian literature of a later period and well-acknowledged by scholarship.

Chapter Conclusions

This chapter examined the relationship of the underlying inaugurated eschatology of *4QInstruction* to the kind of forms used in the text and to the nature of their ethical teaching. It was noted that the text primarily employs the form of the admonition, and that this may include motive clauses utilising both future judgement and creation-patterns. This point provides important information regarding the way in which eschatology can function within paraenesis: it is too simplistic to assume that the only paraenetic material that should be regarded as "eschatological" or "apocalyptic" is material referring to a future judgement. The eschatological paradigm operative in *4QInstruction* means that, ultimately, all ethical behaviour is eschatological insofar as it represents the recovery of a state of fidelity to patterns within creation, facilitated by the eschatological revelation of wisdom.

Despite the generic differences, therefore, *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction* share the idea that the *eschaton* is inaugurated by the revealing of heavenly wisdom, a revealing that has two dimensions: on one hand, a body of wisdom, perhaps made known by an individual revealer figure; on the other, the divine enabling of the remnant community to understand and receive this body of wisdom. The centrality of the concept

[182] Carol A. Newsom. Review of C.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam, DSD* 10 (2003) 431–5.

of wisdom, albeit of a revealed kind, facilitates the uptake of forms and ideas from the sapiential tradition, while the apocalyptic (revealed) character of this wisdom facilitates the uptake of ideas from the apocalyptic and prophetic traditions. The mixing and fusion of forms and ideas from the two traditions is, therefore, only to be expected.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

The Gospel of Matthew can make a fascinating contribution to this study. For a long time, scholars have noted the developed presence of both sapiential and apocalyptic elements within the book, though they have tended to focus on one or the other and to neglect the question of the way in which these two categories of elements might relate to one another.[1] The findings of the two previous chapters suggest that it is worth asking whether or not the answer to this question is to be found in an underlying inaugurated eschatology, centred on the revealing of wisdom to a minority. If such an eschatology may be demonstrated, we may continue by examining its impact upon the ethical material in Matthew. Specifically, we can ask whether in Matthew, as in *4QInstruction*, there is evidence that ethical behaviour is connected to some idea of restored creation.

As with the previous texts studied, some kind of focus is required. I shall, therefore, select three sections within the gospel that may be examined in some depth.

1. The first of these is Matthew 5–7, the Sermon on the Mount, chosen because it is important both to those who argue for the centrality of wisdom in the first gospel and also to those who argue for the importance of apocalyptic in that gospel. Indeed, the association of this section of Matthew with each of the traditions is well established: Schweitzer famously saw the Sermon as reflecting the "interim ethic" of an apocalyptic prophet who expected the imminent end;[2] M. Gilbert, on the other hand, categorised the Sermon as a Christian "Wisdom" work, reporting Jesus teaching "in sapiential form."[3]

---

[1] I have included a summary of previous scholarship as an appendix to the present study.

[2] Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (3rd Edition. Trans. W.C. Montgomery; London: A&C Black, 1954), 352.

[3] M. Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, edited by Michael E. Stone (CRINT 2; Assen: Van Gorcum Press/Minneapolis: Fortress, 1984), 319.

2. The second section to be examined is Matthew 11–12. This section has been chosen for two reasons. First, given the significance of Matt 11:25–30 (and to a lesser extent 11:19) to those who argue for a Matthean Wisdom Christology[4] this section is unavoidable: a study examining the presence of wisdom ideas must interact with such an approach. Second, narrative critical approaches have isolated these chapters as being central to the development of Matthew's key themes and therefore to be the place where we might expect underlying concepts of Matthean theology to emerge.
3. The third section examined is Matt 24–25. This section has been chosen because it is generally understood by New Testament scholars as being the most explicitly apocalyptic section of the gospel,[5] yet a large part of its theology is expressed in the form of parables which fuse its eschatology with the sapiential categories of wisdom and folly. Again, therefore, it seems to be a natural candidate for inclusion in this study.

Prior to an examination of these texts, however, some general comments require to be made concerning the origins of Matthew's gospel.

The Provenance, Date and Authorship of Matthew

Since Streeter's seminal work on the gospels[6] it has largely been assumed by scholars that Matthew's gospel was written in Syrian Antioch, probably in the 80s. Regarding the date, it is generally held that Matthew is dependent upon Mark (c. 65) and must, therefore have been written some time after this. In addition, some parts of the gospel (22:7; 23:38, parts of chapter 24) are understood as detailed *ex eventu* references to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. Finally, the level of degeneration of Jewish-Christian relations held to be reflected by some parts of the gospel are believed to reflect a post-85 C.E. situation, possibly after the introduction of the so called *Birkat ha-Minim.* Regarding provenance, the strongly Jewish character of the gospel points to a locality in which the Jewish population was strong, probably in an urban centre.[7] In addition,

[4] As does, for instance, Witherington, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 341–68.

[5] Whether such an assessment is legitimate will be examined below.

[6] B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, (London: Macmillan, 1924), 520–3.

[7] Gerd Theissen has proposed a more rural setting in Syria, based on the fact that, as he understands it, the work is "theologically much closer to the Didache than to

the extent to which Matthew would later influence the *Didache* and the writings of Ignatius, both associated with Syria (the latter specifically with Antioch) has been seen as supporting the Antiochene connection.[8]

Donald Hagner[9] and R.T. France,[10] however, have each called into question whether the conclusions given above are actually required by the evidence.[11] First, it is not universally agreed that Matthew draws upon Mark, and even if it does, we do not require a long period of time to have elapsed between the writing of the two works.[12] Second, in Hagner's opinion the fact that Matthew does not seek to disentangle the fall of Jerusalem from the end of the age in his redaction of the Markan eschatological discourse (cf. Luke's version of this) suggests that the destruction of Jerusalem had not yet happened.[13] This line of evidence may be reinforced by the presence of redactional material, unique to Matthew, which refers to practices relating to the temple (5:23–4; 17:24–7; 23:16–22).[14] Third, the question of Jewish-Christian relations, including the possible impact of the *Birkat ha-Minim*, is complicated and notoriously problematic as a basis for establishing dates.[15]

---

the Antiochene bishop Ignatius, whose abstract paradoxes are out of harmony with Matthew." *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 251.

[8] For a more in-depth discussion of the background of Matthew, see the various contributions to D.L. Balch, ed., *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross Disciplinary Approaches* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), especially J.D. Kingsbury, "Conclusion: Analysis of a Conversation," 264–65.

[9] Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, Word Biblical Commentary 33A (Waco: Word, 1993) lxxiii–lxxv.

[10] France, *Matthew*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985) 27–30.

[11] Detailed arguments for an early date are also provided by Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 599–609.

[12] Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, lxxiv, comments "Matthew needs only to have been written after Mark—and there is no reason why this needs to have been more than a year or two later, if that." France, *Matthew*, 28, notes also evidence that Clement of Alexandria, unlike most patristic writers, believed Mark to have been written while Peter was still alive, pushing the date of that gospel back.

[13] The question of how the fall of Jerusalem, and specifically the temple, operates within the eschatological schema of Matthew will be taken up, below.

[14] See Gundry, *Matthew*, 604–5.

[15] See Reuben Kimelman, "Birkat Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity" in Sanders (ed.) *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, 226–44. Kimelman is challenged by Lawrence Schiffman in *Who Was a Jew: Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*, (Hoboken: Ktav, 1985), 53–61. Kimelman's view is given further support and defence by Stephen T. Katz, "Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 C.E.: A Reconsideration," *JBL* 103 (1984), 43–76.

Finally, regarding the provenance of the work, Hagner notes the fact "that Antioch is such an attractive hypothesis because we happen to know more about it than about most other cities. It is worth reminding ourselves that Antioch is only a good guess."[16]

Since a measure of uncertainty must remain regarding both the date and provenance of Matthew, no assumptions will be made in the present study as to either of these issues. It is questionable whether a commitment to one view or another would make a great deal of difference to this study, which is concerned with the literary features of the gospel rather than the socio-historical issues relating to a hypothetical Matthean community.

Regarding authorship, tradition has ascribed the gospel to the disciple Matthew,[17] though few modern scholars would entertain this as a possibility.[18] In the present study, the name Matthew will be used to denote the author of the gospel, though no assumptions will be made as to the true identity of this author. Again, it is arguable that such assumptions should have little impact on a study of the literary features of the gospel. The question of authorship is usually tied to questions concerning the historical context of the gospel, specifically, where it fits within Jewish-Christian relations and the "Parting of the Ways." The question of the relationship between Christianity and Judaism, and of whether their ways ever truly parted in the early centuries of the Common Era, is a complicated one, as the comments of Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam Becker, with regard to the traditional concept of the "Parting," highlight:

> Our literary and archaeological data . . . attest a far messier reality than this unilinear spatial metaphor allows.[19]

The relevance of this to the present study is that the desire to locate Matthew within an overly simplistic model of the "Parting of the Ways" can easily lead to the neglect of a proper sensitivity to its literary features.[20]

---

[16] Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, lxxv.

[17] The earliest witness to this tradition is found in a statement made by Papias of Hieropolis (dated to the early second century) and cited in Eusebius, *H.E.* 3:39:16.

[18] France, *Matthew*, 30–4, provides argumentation in support of the traditional view, though he warns that "none of this adds up to anything like proof of authorship."

[19] Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam Becker, "Introduction: Traditional Models and New Directions," in Reed and Becker, eds, *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, TSAJ 95, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 2.

[20] See Anthony J. Saldarini's comments to this effect, in *Matthew's Jewish-Christian Community*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 11–12. His own discussion of Jewish-Christian relations is found on pages 12–26. For an overview of the various

If it is located within anti-Jewish Christianity, then the similarity of those features to other Jewish writings may be ignored or neglected; if it is located within Judaism, then dissimilarities may be ignored in the drive to prove its Jewishness. Since, as Donald Senior comments, "virtually every commentator on Matthew will affirm that this Gospel has strong roots in Judaism and is concerned with issues of traditional importance to Judaism,"[21] it seems best to acknowledge the Jewishness of the Gospel, albeit a Jewishness of a particular and possibly derivative kind, allowing this to provide us with an appropriate conceptual context for our interpretation, but also to be aware that this context is a broad, variegated one within which "Judaism" denotes a loose collective.[22]

Part 1. Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew

Before turning to consider the three sections specified above in detail, it seems important to give some thought to the beginnings of the Matthean narrative as found in chapters 1–4. An examination of these chapters will give us a sense of the shape and direction of the Matthean narrative, of the issues the author wants his readers to be considering as they encounter the detail of later chapters. Two motifs in particular may be noted: "fulfilment" and "new beginning."

a. *Fulfilment*

There is huge amount of secondary material on Matthew 1–4, a great deal more than can be examined in what is, after all, only a preamble to the primary focus of this chapter. I shall, therefore, focus on one particular study, that of David Bauer, which is concerned with the genealogy of Matthew 1:2–16 and its relationship to the wider context of 1:1–4:17.[23] Bauer's study employs narrative criticism, but does so in a

---

major proposals as to how Matthew's gospel relates to Judaism, see Donald Senior, "Directions in Matthean Studies," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*, edited by David E. Aune, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 7–10.

[21] Ibid., 11.

[22] This is not to ignore the complex issues that surround the relationship of Matthew's intended readership to the Jewish parent group, but simply to stress that however we understand that relationship, the Jewish character of Matthew's work is not in question.

[23] David R. Bauer, "The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel," in David R. Bauer and Mark Allen Powell, eds., *Treasures Old and*

way that interacts with other methodologies and thus provides one of the most comprehensive and satisfying examinations of these verses to date.[24]

Bauer begins his study by examining Matthew 1:1, which reads, Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριτσῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. This verse refers, in the first instance, to the genealogy that follows, which expands the readers' awareness of that narrative world and requires us to extend our concept of that world to include the Old Testament narrative.[25] A question of some significance, addressed by Bauer, is whether the phrase βίβλος γενέσεως should be understood as a title to the gospel as a whole, to the genealogy only or to the introductory chapters of the gospel. The first possibility is taken by W.D. Davies,[26] for whom it provides a starting point for his assertion that the gospel as a whole should be understood as describing a new beginning, a new creation. The basis for such a proposal is the connection between the phrase and the LXX translation of Genesis 2:4 and 5:1,[27] where it renders the term תולדות. Hagner cautions against the kind of reading taken by Davies,[28] since the term clearly points, in Matthew 1:1, to the "genesis" of Jesus himself. More detailed arguments against Davies are provided by Bauer,[29] whose rejection of Davies' arguments is not, however, a rejection of the connection with the Genesis texts. In fact, on the strength of the fact that in Gen 2:4 the phrase introduces a narrative, rather than simply a genealogy, he suggests that Matthew "may therefore be drawing the attention of the 'implied reader,' who knows the OT and is directed to the OT repeatedly by Matthew, to a use of the phrase that involves more than a genealogical list."[30]

Bauer proceeds to notice the ways in which the genealogy establishes certain themes that are developed up to 4:17, which he sees as closing the section introduced by the βίβλος γενέσως reference. It is worth

---

New: Contributions to Matthean Studies (SBL Symposium Series 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 130–59.

[24] I shall focus on the first part of Bauer's study, which focuses on the genealogy, and make only brief references to the remaining part of his article.

[25] See David R. Bauer, "The…Function of the Genealogy," 132.

[26] W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 69–72; see also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:149–60.

[27] Davies and others have also enlarged these very specific contact points to include other occurrences of "genesis" language, in the LXX title and in Gen 6:9 and 37:2. See Bauer, "The…Function of the Genealogy," 134–5.

[28] Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 9.

[29] Bauer, "The…Function of the Genealogy," 134–37.

[30] Bauer, "The…Function of the Genealogy," 134.

tracing several of his points in a little detail. He notes, first of all, the fact that βίβλος γενέσως refers to Jesus (the descendant) rather than to Abraham (the forefather), a surprising fact since this is the opposite of the genealogies in Genesis. He comments,

> The unusual practice here of entitling a genealogy according to the name of the last descendant serves to subordinate the forefathers to this last descendant and indicates that they gain their meaning and identity from the final progeny, i.e., from Christ.[31]

He then argues that the genealogy finds its climax in Matthew 1:16, in which the birth of Jesus, "who is called Christ" is mentioned:

> As the high point of culmination toward which all of Israel's history has been moving, Jesus the Christ gives meaning and significance to that history… This affirmation, made here in the genealogy, forms the theological and hermeneutical basis for the "fulfilment quotations" that punctuate the narrative of the gospel.[32]

Having derived these points from the structural arrangement of the genealogy, Bauer then notes two features of the genealogy. The first is the presence of references to "brothers" in verses 2 and 11. The first reference he notes as being connected to the birth of Israel as a nation, referring as it does to the brothers of Judah (thus introducing the idea of the twelve tribes, that is *all* Israel, rather than simply the tribe to which Jesus belonged):

> This reference forms the basis for the presentation, found throughout Matthew's Gospel of Israel as the son/sons of God, with the privileges and potential that belonged to that role, including possession of the kingdom of God.[33]

The latter reference to brothers he notes as being connected to the deportation to Babylon:

> Here the people are pictured, not as recipients of covenant, election and promise, but as objects of judgement… The only event Matthew mentions in the genealogy of Matthew is the Deportation to Babylon, for, as far as he is concerned, this event most accurately depicts the essential character of Israel's history.[34]

---

[31] Ibid., 140.

[32] Ibid., 142. Bauer also argues that 1:1–16 has a chiastic structure that emphasises the title "Christ." On the fulfilment quotations, see below.

[33] Ibid., 144.

[34] Ibid., 145–46.

Such a theme within the genealogy has obvious connections with the presentation of John's ministry in 3:1–2, as he calls for repentance in the light of the imminence of the kingdom.

The second feature of the genealogy that Bauer notes is the presence of references to women: Tamar (v. 3), Rahab (v. 5), Ruth (v. 5), Bathsheba (v. 6) and Mary (v. 16). Examining the various options proposed by scholars to explain these references, he suggests that strongest case is to be made for the idea that, with the exception of Mary, they serve to draw attention to the inclusion of Gentiles into the kingdom, thus fulfilling that aspect of the promise made to Abraham that in him, all nations of the earth would be blessed (Gen 12:3).[35] The mention of Mary serves a different purpose: her inclusion anchors the genealogy to the subsequent narrative of the virginal conception and thus to the unique role that God played in the birth of Jesus:

> The mention of Mary does not draw attention to her own role as much as it does to the role of God, in that it indicates that Jesus was not the natural son of Joseph, but was the Son of God. In 1:18–25, the emphasis is upon neither the role or character of Mary, nor the anomalous character of the birth, but rather on the divine origin of Jesus.[36]

This feature allows Bauer to see a connection between the genealogy and the Son of God Christology argued for by Kingsbury.[37]

Bauer's final observation on the genealogy itself[38] is that that the breakdown of the genealogy into groups of fourteen generations in 1:17, each culminating with key moments in Israel's history (David's birth in 1:6; the exile in 1:11; the Christ in 1:16), while possibly an instance of *gematria* on David's name,[39] also suggests to the reader a sense of divine purpose within history and, thus, emphasises the ideas isolated above.[40]

---

[35] Bauer, 148–49 presents good arguments against A.J. Levine's objections to regarding the women as Gentiles. See *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History: "Go Nowhere Among the Gentiles…" (Matt. 10:56)*, (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14; New York: Mellen, 1988), 59–88.

[36] Ibid., 147–50. These are the primary goals of the references to the women mentioned by Bauer, but he also suggests that their marginal status is of significance.

[37] J.D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, (London: SPCK, 1976).

[38] Ibid., 150–152.

[39] See Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1977), 69–70.

[40] Bauer, "The…Function of the Genealogy," 152, has an extended footnote that raises problems with the view that has seen the genealogy as reflecting a chronology derived from the Apocalypse of Weeks. His principal argument is that the focus in Matthew is on the divisibility of the genealogy by the number fourteen, rather than on

What this discussion highlights is that the genealogy, as the "entry point to the narrative world of Matthew,"[41] above all else seems intended to establish the "present time" of the Matthean narrative as the time of fulfilment.[42] The sense of fulfilment is developed by the Scriptural quotations employed in the opening chapters of the gospel and often introduced by a passive form of the verb πληρόω ("to fulfil"). Such quotations are found in 1:22–23; 2:5–6; 2:15, 17–18, 23; 3:3 (where it is used of John) and 4:14–16. Each of these quotations is intended to suggest that the coming of Jesus, and the events surrounding that advent, are the fulfilment of prophecies and expectations found within the Hebrew Scriptures.

b. *New Beginning*

An obvious corollary of this emphasis on fulfilment in the opening chapters of Matthew, however, is the idea that the events surrounding the coming of Jesus signify a new beginning for God's people. This idea has been suggested from a narrative-critical point of view by Perry Kea,[43] who has argued that the genealogy and fulfilment quotations convey such a sense:

> The new time evoked by Jesus's presence is a time of eschatological joy and blessing.[44]

---

the total number forty-two (which might otherwise correspond to the end of the sixth week). Still, it is interesting that both see history as being ordered by God into periods based around the number seven; Matthew's genealogy could be seen as arranging history into fortnights. I would be uncomfortable in pushing this too far, however, and would rather not base any conclusions upon such an argument.

[41] I am here paraphrasing the language of Bauer, ibid., 156–59.

[42] The fact that the genealogy ultimately goes back to Abraham (1:1–2) has been noted and developed by Blaine Charette (*The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*, 64–72), who sees the significance of the reference to Abraham here, and at further points in the narrative, as deliberately suggestive of the covenant made in Genesis 12:1–3 and reiterated in Gen 15, a covenant which, of course, is of profound significance within Deuteronomic theology. Such a background, according to Charette, suggests that the idea of the restoration of the land to God's people, and the lifting of curses from it, will be a major theme in the gospel that is introduced by this genealogy.

[43] Perry Kea, "The Sermon on the Mount: Ethics and Eschatological Time," *SBLSP 1986*, 88–98.

[44] Ibid., 91. Kea uses the language that the "plotted time" of Matthew's gospel is a "middle time," bringing to fulfilment expectations from the past of Matthew's narrative world and establishing the necessary "potentiality" for the future. Kea, interestingly, relates this sense of fulfilment and new beginning to Matthew 13:16–17, where the idea of a revelation unavailable to previous generations is in view.

While the use of the term "eschatological" may be premature at this point in our study, the material studied in this and following chapters will support the validity of its use.

As part of this idea of a "new beginning," it is possible to make a more cautious appropriation of the long-standing belief, advocated by many scholars, that there is a "New Moses" typology operative in the opening chapters of Matthew and, indeed, throughout the gospel.[45] The core ideas cited in defence of such a position include the possibility of the gospel being deliberately structured in five-fold form, as a kind of Matthean Pentateuch,[46] and the presence of deliberate allusions to the opening chapters of Exodus in Matthew 1–4. Caution should be exercised in considering the "New Moses" idea: the structural arguments for a Matthean Pentateuch in particular are generally acknowledged to be problematic.[47] Nevertheless, the suggestion that there are deliberate allusions being made to the Exodus account is, if correct, of major conceptual importance to all that follows and so some assessment of this must be made.

Several features of the narrative of Matthew 1–4 are often taken as intentionally reminiscent of the story of Moses and the Exodus: the flight to Egypt (2:13–15), culminating with the return from Egypt, described as fulfilling the words of Hosea 11:1; the murder of the innocents (2:16–18); and the period of Jesus testing in the wilderness (4:1–11) are the key features. As Davies[48] and France[49] both note, however, much of the imagery often regarded as reflecting a *New Moses*-typology may actually reflect a *New Israel*-typology.[50] It is surely of note that the passage in Hosea 11:1, cited in Matt 2:15, refers not to Moses but to Israel as a nation. It seems safer, therefore, to speak of a new beginning for Israel, parallel to that experienced in their liberation from Egypt: a new Israel is being birthed in the coming of Jesus.

If correct, however, this point still leaves open an important connection with Moses, for at the heart of the Exodus account is the idea of a

---

[45] Most recently, Dale C. Allison has developed this point in *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

[46] This idea was first expressed in developed form by B.W. Bacon in his "The Five Books of Matthew against the Jews," *ExpTim* 15 (1918), 55–66 and, in more developed form, in *Studies in Matthew*, (New York: Holt, 1930).

[47] See France's summary of the criticisms of the theory, in: *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1989), 142–145.

[48] W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 47–48.

[49] France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 186.

[50] So, too, Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 350.

revelation being made to Israel through that figure. If, therefore, allusion is being made to the Exodus, and that allusion is intended to suggest that a new Israel is being born, then the reader may expect to find an evidence of a fresh revelation being made, of a "new Sinai." As the study turns to the Sermon on the Mount, I shall argue that this block of teaching is presented in precisely these terms and thus presents itself as a work of radical newness.

Wisdom Ideas in the Gospel's Introduction?

Before turning to Matthew 5–7, however, one final aspect of the opening chapters of Matthew deserves further attention, that of the visit of the Magi (2:1–12). Witherington[51] connects this feature with the depiction of Jesus as the Son of David, the one greater than Solomon, whom we would expect seers or counsellors to visit. Witherington's overall view of Matthew's gospel—that it portrays Jesus as "the one greater than Solomon," and draws primarily upon a Wisdom-Christology—will be critiqued below; at this stage, it is sufficient to note that the presence of figures representative of wisdom, who have specifically come to honour Jesus, prepares the reader for the fact that Jesus will likewise be a figure of wisdom. Furthermore, the fact that foreign sages are coming to worship him suggests that his wisdom will not just be for the descendants of Abraham, but for the whole world, an idea at home in some of the eschatological scenarios we have studied already and which will connect with ideas that will be developed in later chapters. Finally, it may be noted that as figures of wisdom, the magi probably represent "mantic wisdom," setting the stage for the great transmitter of revealed wisdom.

Inaugurated Eschatology and Revealed Wisdom in the Sermon on the Mount

i. *Jesus, Revelation and Law*

The opening chapters of Matthew's gospel, then, prepare its reader for a story of momentous import: it is (certainly) presented as being the time of the fulfilment of Old Testament expectation, and (possibly) as the time of Israel's re-birth. At its heart is Jesus, the Son of David, taking his rightful place as anointed king. That king enters the world in the midst of events reminiscent of the Exodus and undergoes a time of

[51] Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 353.

testing in the wilderness similar to that experienced by Israel, but with one great difference: where his forefathers failed, Jesus triumphs.[52] It is within such a dramatic context, then, that the Sermon on the Mount is encountered by the reader of Matthew's Gospel. It is, therefore, hardly surprising to find an emphasis on the uniqueness of Jesus' authority within the Sermon. We must examine this emphasis and ask whether it reflects the idea of eschatologically revealed wisdom that we have seen in previous chapters.

Matthew brackets the Sermon with references that suggest the authority of Jesus over and against the leaders of the day. The significance of Jesus' sitting to teach in 5:1 has been frequently noted,[53] as has the response of the crowd to his teaching in 7:28–9: astonishment (ἐξεπλήσσοντο) at his authority, which is specifically contrasted with that of the scribes (ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν).[54] Several features of the narrative make it difficult to reduce this authority, as does Betz,[55] to simply that of a rabbi, albeit a venerated one.

First, the mountaintop setting is suggestive of Moses-type imagery.[56] There are, as has been seen, clear allusions being made in the opening chapters of Matthew to the Exodus narrative, and this prepares the reader for the idea that some fresh revelation will be made by God as it was in the original Exodus. Given such a context, it is hard to resist the idea that the mountaintop scene of Matthew 5:1 is intended to parallel Sinai in some sense. Davies and Allison specifically argue that the use of "when he had gone up…when he had come down" (5:1; 8:1) at the

---

[52] See Psalm 95:7–11 for this idea of failed testing in the wilderness.

[53] See, Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, (Waco: Word, 1993), 86; Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*, (trans. W.C. Linss, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 224; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:424; Gundry, *Matthew*, 66. The reference to sitting is not found in Luke.

[54] Matthew's language here echoes that found in Mark 1:22 (see also Luke 4:32). In both of these accounts it is linked to Jesus teaching in the synagogue in Capernaum. Matthew is unique not only in shifting the crowd's reaction to this point in the narrative, but also in allowing the reader access to the teaching that elicits the response. In Matthew, it is specifically the content of the Sermon on the Mount that is presented as coming with such authority. From a narratival point of view, then, the response of the crowds highlights the remarkable authority embodied in the Sermon.

[55] H.D. Betz, "The Problem of Christology in the Sermon on the Mount," in T.W. Jennings, ed., *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament: Festschsrift for Hendrikus W. Boers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 191–209.

[56] For a full discussion of the Mosaic allusions, including a refutation of those who disagree that such allusions are present here, see Allison, *The New Moses*, 172–80. While unconvinced by Allison's thesis as a whole, I find this specific section of it to be well argued.

beginning and end of the Sermon reinforce the Mosaic connotations.[57] This aspect of the setting may be contrasted with that of Luke, who presents this teaching as being delivered on a level place (Luke 6:17).

Second, moving in from the two ends of the Sermon, further elements in Jesus' language suggest that his message comes with a level of authority that can only be described as divine. Leaving aside for the time being the block of teaching known as the Beatitudes and the discussion of the Law in 5:17–20, the language used in the so-called "antitheses" (5:21–48) should be noted.[58] Here, Jesus dialogues with familiar tradition regarding the keeping of the Law, introducing these traditions with the words, "You have heard that it was said…" (Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη) before introducing his own teaching with the words "But I say to you…" (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν). The combination of phrases has been understood by Hans Dieter Betz as introducing rabbinic debate over tradition.[59] But the view that Jesus is simply introducing his own teaching as a rabbinic counter-position is problematic for two reasons. First, Martin Hengel has argued that the word ὑμῖν does not occur in the introduction of rabbinic counter-positions and so, on formal grounds Betz's position is problematic.[60] Second, and more importantly, there is a lack of exegetical support in the argumentation of Jesus. He does not seek to provide a basis for what he says in the authority of Scripture; rather the authority is entirely his own. Such a feature is not consonant with the notion that his authority is simply that of a rabbi—in such a case we would expect exegetical support to be adduced—but it is consonant with the idea that his authority is that of a revealer of the divine will.[61]

---

[57] *Matthew*, 1:424. See also Allison's comments, *The New Moses*, 179–180, for this last point.

[58] While much of the material found in the antitheses is found also in Luke, the arrangement in "antithetical" form is unique to Matthew.

[59] Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 215.

[60] M. Hengel, "Zur matthäischen Bergpredigt und ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund," *TRu 52* (1987) 376. Hengel's view is that the word introduces a prophetic edge to Jesus' words. See also Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 111, and my own discussion of this passage below, which will deal more fully with the question of precisely what is being interacted with and the nature of that interaction.

[61] Regarding the distinction with rabbinic argumentation, note also the comments of David Daube (*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* [London: Athlone Press, 1956], 57–58) regarding the antitheses: "The tone is not academic but final, prophetic, maybe somewhat defiant. Nor is there any reasoning."

This point is reinforced at the other end of the Sermon by the words in 7:24 & 26: "Anyone who hears these words of mine…" (Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους). Two points should be noted here regarding these words. First, if the general agreement that the parable of the wise and foolish builders is eschatological in nature[62] is correct, then fidelity to the words uttered by Jesus serves as the criterion by which the wise and the foolish are judged, a startling re-appropriation of the role formerly played by Torah. Second, the use of "rock" imagery in the parable draws upon imagery associated with God himself,[63] thus again reinforcing the impression that the authority of Jesus' words is nothing less than that of God. The Christological dimensions of this point may only be properly discussed in the context of the gospel as a whole. At the present stage of the discussion, it is appropriate only to note that the language accords, at the very least, the status of divine revelation to Jesus' teaching.

The passage in 5:17–20 that deals with the question of the relationship of Jesus to the Law may now be dealt with. Discussions of these verses have focused on the significance of ἦλθον ("I have come"), πληρῶσαι ("to fulfil") and the double occurrence of ἕως ἂν ("until") in 5:18. Most would agree that in the context of the gospel, and especially in the light of the "fulfilment" emphasis throughout the opening chapters of Matthew,[64] ἦλθον should be understood as having eschatological connotations.[65] There is less agreement, however, about πληρῶσαι and ἕως ἄν.

The use of πληρῶσαι has broadly been understood in three ways:[66] 1) to keep the ethical commands of the Law[67] 2) to fulfil the prophecies and types of Jesus' life and ministry (and possibly his death)[68] 3) to teach the law in such a way as to bring out its definitive meaning, possibly by adding to it.[69] It is surely of some importance that almost all of the

---

[62] See Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H.J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, (trans. P. Scott; London: SCM Press, 1963), 16–17; also Daniel Marguerat, *Le Jugement dans l'Evangile de Matthieu*, 22, 24, 203–211.

[63] See, for example, Gen 49:24; Deut 32:4, 18, 30, 31, 37; 1 Sam 2:2; 22:47; Psalm 89:26; 94:22; 95:1. Many other examples could be cited.

[64] See, for instance, Matt. 1:22; 2:15,17; 2:23; 3:15; 4:14, as well as our discussion of new Moses/Israel typology.

[65] See the discussion in Marguerat, *Le Jugement*, 124.

[66] I am here following the breakdown offered by Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 105–6.

[67] So Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 260–5; Marguerat, *Le Jugement*, 131.

[68] Gundry, *Matthew*, 78–81.

[69] Betz's interpretation should probably also be grouped within this category. See *Sermon on the Mount*, 173–9.

occurrences of πληρόω in Matthew refer to the fulfilment of prophecy[70] and that the reference here is to both the Law and the Prophets, so that a simple reduction of meaning to "obedience" is impossible. Nevertheless, the fact that the text goes on to speak of the judgement that awaits those who diminish the importance of the Law (19–20) means that the ethical dimension of "keeping" the Law remains central to the text. This point is of fundamental importance: whatever disagreements may be held by scholars regarding these phrases, it is beyond doubt that they reflect the highest possible respect for the Law.

This is a crucial departure point for discussions of the antitheses. As Jesus delivers his teaching with the words, "But I say to you…," it is regarded by some scholars as impossible that this should refer to the Law, given the preceding statements, and that instead it must refer to rabbinic interpretations.[71] Three points, however, require to be taken into account. First, as Gundry notes,[72] the adversative is weak: δὲ, is used, rather than the much stronger ἀλλὰ. Second, the common drift of each of the so-called antitheses is towards intensification of the commandments, a fact that may suggest that we are party to more than just the to and fro of rabbinic argument. The terminology of "antithesis" may in itself, therefore, be misleading, since it suggests *denial* of a command, rather than *intensification*. Third, the fact is that, with the exception of "and hate your enemy" in 5:43,[73] there is no citation of anything but Scripture by Jesus. Betz has argued that the use of ἠκούσατε ("you have heard") points "by implication"[74] to the hearing of *traditions* concerning the Law, a case he sees as being supported by the reference to the "men of old" (τοῖς ἀρχαίοις).[75] The negative discussion must, therefore, challenge as flawed the *traditional* understanding of the Torah:

---

[70] So Matt. 1:22; 2:15,17; 2:23; 3:15; 4:14; 5:17; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 26:54; 26:56; 27:9 (but not 13:48 and 23:32).

[71] See Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 111 and, J. Jeremias, *NT Theology* (Trans J. Bowden, 2 vols; London: SCM, 1974), 1:144–45.

[72] Gundry, *Matthew*, 83; also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:507.

[73] This phrase, of course, is not found in the Law. Some have argued that its background is in the Qumran texts (1QS 1:4, 10–11; 9:21–26). It may, though, reflect the sentiment expressed in Pss. 26:5, 139:21–22 and Deut 7:2, 30:7.

[74] Betz, *Sermon*, 215.

[75] John Kampen, "The Sectarian Form of the Antitheses within the Social World of the Matthean Community," *DSD* 1 (1994), 343–45, provides a helpful discussion of this term, although his eventual conclusion—that it refers, in the Matthean text, to the Qumran sectarians—is based upon slender terminological evidence that ignores the function of this section within the Sermon on the Mount.

> Rather than constituting a proof verified by antiquity, the chain of tradition is judged to be a history of error.[76]

Against this, however, stands the fact that what they have heard (with the exception of 5:43) are the very words of the Law: the citation formula in each of the antitheses introduces Scripture. Moreover, it is not clear that when Jesus discusses the practice of implementing the Law in the first antithesis he is implying that there is something *wrong* with this practice, that there is "error," to use Betz's language. Ultimately, Betz has based his point on a single possible implication of the word ἠκούσατε, but it is an implication that is not necessary, particularly in a society heavily dependant on oral transmission within which the Torah would primarily have been "heard."[77]

The view that Jesus is countering either traditional views of the Law or rabbinic opinions must, then, be rejected. The interpretation that he is rejecting Torah would, however, seem to go against 5:17–20, so that we are pushed in the direction of agreeing with Davies and Allison that the unfortunately-named antitheses are actually intensifications of Torah, not corrections. Such intensifications imply that there is an inadequacy in the standards found in Torah, which therefore need to be supplemented with revealed wisdom. This idea is similar to that observed in the study of *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*.

ii. *Jesus, Eschatology and Pre-Existent Wisdom*

It is well acknowledged that there existed a stream within Jewish thought—testified to particularly by Sirach 24—that saw Torah as "the historical manifestation in Israel of a pre-temporal wisdom."[78] wisdom was not to be simply identified with Torah, but was, at least in the understanding of certain writers, the greater category. To quote Witherington, "That Wisdom is embodied or expressed in Torah does not mean it is exhausted thereby."[79] The centrality of wisdom to creation is important in this context. The idea arises in Proverbs 6:22–31 and possibly in Job 28:25–7 and is sustained in Sirach 39:12–35. Within one of the

---

[76] Betz, *Sermon*, 215.

[77] For further criticisms of the argument that the reference is to traditional interpretations rather than to the OT itself, see Gundry, *Matthew*, 84 and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:506–509.

[78] Gabrielle Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E.–200 C.E.*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 88–89.

[79] Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 96. Against those who simply identify Wisdom with Torah, see Witherington's comments on 98.

fragments of *4QInstruction*[80] studied in chapter 3, the idea seems to have been re-appropriated in terms of רז נהיה, the "Mystery of Existence," the wisdom revealed to the elect upon which creation has been founded. Is it possible that what underlies the antitheses is the idea that the Law is merely an earthly expression of wisdom and that Jesus is now revealing that wisdom in its truest sense? Several lines of argumentation may be drawn.

First, when the Sermon on the Mount is set within the context of Matthew's gospel it may be seen as part of a work of wisdom and as the words of a figure closely associated with wisdom itself. Crucial to this point is the depiction of Jesus in 11:28–30, which will be discussed later in this chapter. This text almost certainly draws on the imagery of Sirach 6:23ff and 51:26ff. Assuming at this stage that Deutsch[81] and Witherington[82] are correct in arguing for this background to the text, which, of course, is concerned with revelation (11:25–27), then the reader of Matthew's gospel is challenged to see the Sermon on the Mount as the teaching of one so closely associated with Wisdom that he can speak of himself in terms usually reserved for Wisdom itself. This impression is reinforced by the use of forms within the Sermon that are associated with the Wisdom tradition (parables, beatitudes,[83] et cetera).

Second, the temporal nature of the Torah is reflected in 5:18. There has been much discussion of the two ἕως ἂν clauses and whether they are to be understood differently.[84] The important point at this stage in the discussion, however, is simply that the use of παρέλθη ("pass away") in conjunction with the description of the end of the created realm[85] points, as Betz notes, to the createdness of Torah[86] and its shared transience with creation. The reader of Matthew's gospel will be struck also by the similarity of this phrase with that found in 24:35:

> Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away.

---

[80] 4Q417 1i 8–13.

[81] C. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25–30*, (JSNTSup 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); and "Wisdom in Matthew: Transformation of a Symbol," *NovT* 32 (1990), 13–47.

[82] Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 361. Note the repudiation of the challenges levelled by Stanton at the Wisdom associations of this passage.

[83] Note Guelich's argument that formally the Matthean beatitudes resemble the beatitudes of the Wisdom tradition rather than those found in apocalypses. "Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance-requirements' or Eschatological Blessings?" *JBL* 95 (1976): 415–434.

[84] See the summary of the discussion in Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 107.

[85] "Heaven and earth" here is a reference to the created realm. The word pair is generally used in Matthew with this sense.

[86] Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 183. Also see Bornkamm, *Gesammelte Aufsätze, BET* 18 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1958), 4.77–8. The eternity of Torah is a later rabbinic idea,

The tense may be different, but the same verb (παρέρχομαι) is used. Indeed, so close is the link between the two verses that the Latin manuscript (c) has inserted these words into the text of Matthew 5:18. The point of note should be obvious: Torah is portrayed as an earthly and temporal thing, while Jesus' teaching is presented as eternal.

Third, the climactic parable of the Sermon on the Mount presents the response to Jesus' words in terms of wisdom and folly, reinforcing the sapiential impression of the sermon as a whole. Not only does it serve this function, however: the parable clearly equates wisdom with Jesus' teaching since the wise man is the one who "hears these words of mine and puts them into practice" (7:24).

With these lines of argumentation in place, two other features may now be noted. First, the climax of 5:17–20 is the statement that the righteousness of Jesus' followers must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees. Had the reference here simply been to the Pharisees, then we might see this as to be paralleled with the scorn for the Pharisees seen in the Damascus Document 1:18–20 (as it is generally read). However, with the reference to the scribes also found in the text, it may be suggested that at this point in the text[87] there is nothing pejorative in the mention of these groups and that they are instead mentioned because they constitute two groups known for their commitment to the Law. The challenge of this verse would, then, be for a righteousness that does not diminish the Law, but rather goes beyond it, a notion that would be in keeping with the idea that Torah is but an earthly and therefore inferior expression of heavenly wisdom.

The second point is that the whole discussion of the relationship of Jesus and his teaching to the Law (in 5:17–48) is linked by the "fulfilment" language of 5:17&18 to the opening chapters of Matthew and thus to the emphasis already noted that these chapters present Jesus as the culmination of expectation. This serves to develop a sense of his teaching as being eschatological, but also serves to make that teaching central to Matthew's eschatology. Again, this represents a significant similarity with the texts studied in the previous two chapters.

To conclude this point: the opening chapters of Matthew's gospel convey the sense that a time of eschatological fulfilment has come and that

---

so Georg Strecker, *Die Bergpredikt: ein exegetischer Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1984), 58, should, therefore, not be followed.

[87] In Matthew 23, both groups will be denounced, but this is a later stage in Matthew's narrative, after the rejection of Jesus' wisdom by these groups.

as Jesus goes up on the mountain a new revelation will be given. His own language within the Sermon on the Mount suggests that his speech carries divine authority and that the wise are distinguished from the foolish on the strength of their response to that teaching. The use of wisdom forms and imagery, particularly seen against the background of the gospel as a whole, suggests that wisdom is being revealed in Jesus' words and that this wisdom is of a more fundamental and lasting nature than Torah.

Inaugurated Eschatology and Revealed Wisdom in Matthew 11–12

The importance of chapters 11 and 12 to an understanding of the Gospel of Matthew as a whole has increasingly been accepted by scholars. Studies such as those by Verseput[88] and, more recently, Lybæk[89] have demonstrated that the section is a carefully constructed presentation of two themes that are crucial to the gospel as a whole: first, the status of Jesus as Messiah/Coming One and, second, his rejection by the Jewish leaders. The second of these themes, in particular, may highlight the centrality of these chapters to the gospel, since the narrative critical studies of both Matera[90] and Kingsbury[91] have seen the rejection of Jesus by Israel to be the "turning point of its narrative logic."[92]

Both of the themes mentioned above are of interest to our present study since they are intimately connected with the idea of Jesus as the one who reveals wisdom to a chosen minority in the eschatological period. As I shall argue below, at the heart of these two chapters that are, in turn, at the heart of the gospel, Matthew 11:25–30—a sub-section clearly dealing with the concept of "revelation" and often understood to be identifying Jesus with Wisdom itself—is given a place of primary importance by the author. Two questions must be asked of this section and its context: first, what is the nature of the wisdom revealed by Jesus? Second, what is his relationship to that wisdom?

These questions are essential because I have been arguing that the central concept of wisdom in the texts studied in chapters 2 and 3 is

---

[88] Donald P. Verseput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11–12*, (European University Studies; Theology 291; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986).

[89] Lena Lybæk, *New and Old in Matthew 11–13: Normativity in the Development of Three Theological Themes*, (FRLANT 198; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002).

[90] Frank Matera, "The Plot of Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 49 (1987), 233–53.

[91] Jack Kingsbury, "The Plot of Matthew's Story," *Interpretation* 46 (1992), 347–56.

[92] John Yueh-Han Yieh, *One Teacher: Jesus' Teaching Role in Matthew's Gospel Report* (BZNW 124; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 30.

that it comprises a body of knowledge, divinely revealed to a remnant in the last days and assimilating concepts associated with traditional wisdom. It is, therefore, a wisdom "from above" and many would happily, therefore, call it "apocalyptic," even though in many ways it presents itself as "sapiential." Some have argued that the depiction of wisdom in Matthew 11:25–30 is contrary to this idea. Thus, according to Luz, "It cannot be denied that Jesus contradicts a broad stream of apocalyptic, Essene, and rabbinic thinking."[93] Similarly, Lybæk, arguing against those who would read these verses against the background of apocalypticism, says,

> The implication of these interpretations is an understanding of heavenly mysteries as something which is imparted only to a certain group of the elect. This is not so. For Matthew, the heavenly mysteries consist in God's compassion for God's people. This is knowledge openly available unless one's heart is hardened.[94]

The first question, then, concerns whether we can see a similar concept of wisdom operative in Matthew 11–12 as we saw in the texts studied in chapters 2 and 3. The wisdom in these chapters may legitimately be seen as similar to that observed in those texts if it is:

1. clearly depicted as being revealed in the eschatological period,
2. clearly depicted as being revealed to a small remnant within a wider body of unfaithful Israel,
3. suggestive of an insufficiency in Torah.

If these three characteristics are true of it, then the assessments of Lybæk and Luz of the nature of wisdom in Matthew 11–12 are untenable and a background in apocalyptic concepts will be preferred.

The second question concerns the relationship of Jesus to the wisdom that he reveals. Specifically, should Jesus be understood as being identified not merely *with* but actually *as* that wisdom? This is the suggestion of those who have sought to argue for a "Wisdom-Christology" in Matthew 11:25–30 and, by implication, in the gospel as a whole. Those who have argued for a Wisdom-Christology in Matthew and elsewhere in the New Testament, have done so with two goals in view. The first is to explain the development of the doctrine of pre-existence in early

---

[93] Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 163.

[94] Lybæk, *New and Old*, 205. Her comments here are surprising, given her emphasis throughout on the eschatological nature of these chapters.

Christianity and to provide a Jewish background to this view; Robert Hammerton-Kelly, in particular, has sought to do this.[95] The other goal of those who have argued for a Wisdom-Christology is to defend the idea that a "high" Christology, in which Jesus is portrayed as divine, goes back to the early Church and possibly the historical Jesus; Ben Witherington's work is an example of this.[96] An assessment of this idea will be an important part of this study.

In what follows, then, Matthew 11–12 will be studied and these two questions borne in mind. Not every pericope will be studied: some are less relevant than others and while perhaps containing much that is interesting, they may not advance our study in any significant way.

1. *John's Question and Jesus' Response (Matt 11:1–6)*

After a transitional sentence (11:1) that continues to present Jesus' ministry in didactic terms, Matthew relates that John, having "heard of the works of the Christ," sends his disciples to ask if he is the Coming One (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) or if they are to expect another. The reference to "works" (ἔργα) has often been seen as part of an *inclusio* with 11:19, where wisdom's works are referred to (probably redactionally).[97] As Verseput[98] notes, however, there is no natural segregation of this section from the rest of Matthew 11–12 and no obvious function to the *inclusio.* Instead, it is better to appreciate that the references in verses 1 and 19 create a link between this whole section and the description of Jesus public ministry as depicted in chapters 5–9.[99]

Discussion of John's question has inevitably centred on the meaning of ὁ ἐρχόμενος, and whether appropriate background texts may be identified for the term.[100] For the most part, this discussion does little

---

[95] R. Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (SNTSMS 21; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

[96] B. Witherington, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

[97] Cf. Luke 7:35. See M.D. Johnson, "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology," *CBQ* 36 (1974) 57–58; J.S. Kloppenborg, "Wisdom Christology in Q," *Laval Theologique et Philosophique* 34 (1978), 130.

[98] *Rejection*, 116.

[99] "Being defined in 11:4 as what has been heard and seen, and being described in 11:5 as healing and preaching, it refers back not only to the miracle chapters 8–9, but also to the sermon on the mount, 5–7, interpreting Jesus' authoritative words and his mighty deeds as messianic." Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:240.

[100] Usually suggested are Gen 49:10; Ps 118:26; Is 59:20; Hab 2:3; Zech 9:9; and 14:5. See Verseput, *Rejection*, 63; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 133.

to advance an understanding of the scene, but one interesting point is made by Novakovic. Developing a trajectory of "end-time expectation" from Hab 2:3, through its interpretation in various texts (including rabbinic works and 4QHabPesh), and into Matthew 11:3, she notes that John's question reflects a broad concern over the delay or hidden-ness of the end-time but also emphasises the close identification of that end-time with a person: "John's question in fact does not refer to the recognition of the messianic time, but to the recognition of the Messiah himself, as the emphatic pronoun σὺ. and the terms ὁ ἐρχόμενος and ἕτερον clearly indicate."[101]

Whatever uncertainties there may be regarding which texts lie behind this question, Verseput is surely correct in stating that the point of the question within the narrative is its answer.[102] Jesus begins by commanding them to tell John what they "hear and see." Luz makes the interesting point that the positioning of "hear" at the beginning of the response (i.e. before "and see") and final positioning of the reference to the gospel being preached in verse 5 creates a chiastic bracket around the miracle report, a structure that he takes as giving pre-eminence to Jesus' teaching, as it is found in the Sermon on the Mount.[103] If the observation is correct, then even here Matthew, or the tradition on which he drew, is concerned to foreground Jesus' teaching within this eschatological section.

As with John's question, much discussion has arisen as to the background of Jesus' account of his ministry in 11:4–5. Most would see Isaiah 26:19; 29:18; 35:5–6 and 61:1[104] as providing this background, though, as Novakovic notes,[105] none of the passages is quoted. Instead, the Matthean text draws upon the vocabulary of these verses (τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρὶζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται), departing most obviously from the source texts by using present tenses

---

[101] Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: a Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew*, (WUNT 2.170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 159.

[102] Verseput, *Rejection*, 66.

[103] Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 134.

[104] In addition to the Biblical texts suggested as background, 4Q521, the so-called *Messianic Apocalypse* from Qumran, is often discussed. This text also seems to draw on these Isaianic passages. See G.G. Xeravits, "Wisdom Traits in the Qumranic Presentation of the Eschatological Prophet," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (edited by F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 183–192, for a discussion of this text, particularly whether the term "apocalyptic" should be applied to it.

[105] *Messiah*, 160. See her helpful table of vocabulary parallels on this page.

rather than futures.[106] In the context of such strong allusive similarity, this shift in tense is all the more conspicuous and has the effect of creating a sense of fulfilment within the passage.[107] What is striking is that Jesus' response, by referring to the events of his ministry in third person (possibly intended to be understood as divine-passive)[108] forms, centres not on his own personal status, but rather on the significance of those events as indicating that the present time is the time of salvation. Thus, where John's question is concerned not with the messianic time but with the person of the Messiah, Jesus' response focuses on the former and evades the latter.[109] This point is important because it gives primary importance to the eschatological dimension within this section. On this level, at least at this point in the text, it is more important *when* Jesus is than *who* Jesus is.

It is this issue that is developed by Novakovic in her treatment of the connection between messianic expectation and the healing ministry of Jesus. The conclusion of her study is as follows:

> Matthew's exegetical activity and clarifying comments show that although Jesus' healings cannot authenticate his messianic vocation, they can facilitate human recognition of the messianic character of the time in which they take place and through this contribute to the revelation of Jesus' messianic identity.[110]

---

[106] Cf. the LXX text of Isaiah 35:5–6: τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν καὶ ὦτα κωφῶν ἀκούσνται ὁτε ἀλεῖται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων ὅτι ἐρράγη ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὕδωρ καὶ φάραγξ ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ. The tenses in Isaiah 61:1 are not, of course, future.

[107] For eschatological readings of Isaiah 61:1, see J.J. Collins, "A Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61:1–3 and its Actualization in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed., C.A. Evans and S. Talmon, Biblical Interpretation Series 28. Leiden: Brill, 1997), 225–240. Also note James R. Davila's study of 11QMelchizedek as reflecting eschatological expectation drawing upon Isaiah 61:1: "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 269–71. The argument refines Margaret Barker's "The Time is Fulfilled: Jesus and Jubilee," *SJT* 53 (2000), 22–32.

[108] Of the verbs that occur in Matt 11:5, three are active (the blind see, the lame walk and the deaf hear) and three are passive. In the case of the active verbs the obvious inference is that God is the ultimate agent of this healing. Whether we should read the forms as divine passives is, on one level, immaterial: the key point is that Jesus' answers John's question not with a statement about his actions, with verbs in which he is the subject, but with a statement about events currently taking place.

[109] See Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 134–5.

[110] Novakovic, *Messiah*, 190.

This emphasis on Messianic *time* rather than Messianic *identity* is doubly important for the present study. First, as already noted, it emphasises the eschatological context of Jesus' revelation: the plotted time of Matthew's gospel is eschatological time. Second, it renders untenable one particular aspect of the "Wisdom-Christology" seen in Matthew's gospel by Witherington, who sees the miracle accounts in 8–9, which lie behind these verses, as presenting Jesus as the Solomonic king.[111]

Witherington, and those whose work he has developed,[112] have drawn upon Josephus' *Antiquities* 8.2.5 (together with seemingly related Jewish traditions and the archaeological discovery of medieval[113] incantation bowls bearing Solomon's name) in which Solomon is presented as an exorcist. A full refutation of the idea that this provides the background to the use of the title "Son of David" in Matthew 8–9 may be found in Novakovic,[114] but two obvious problems may be noted. First, Solomon's activity in the Josephus account is very much portrayed as an art, one that can be learned and emulated by others (a fact witnessed to by the description of Eleazer, who follows Solomon's teaching and casts out demons). This contrasts with the presentation of Jesus' healing as miraculous expressions of divine power in Matthew 8–9. It also means that there would be nothing unique about Jesus performing this art: he would be no more the Son of David than Eleazer was. Second, the Matthean narrative consistently prefers to depict and describe Jesus miraculous work as *healing* rather than *exorcism*, often altering accounts of exorcism in a more "therapeutic" direction.[115] While healing and exorcism may not be clearly distinct from one another in the ancient world, these deliberate alterations would seem at odds with an attempt to present Jesus as a new Solomon, given that the latter was remembered as an exorcist more than as a healer. In short, a supposed Solomon typology cannot be defended in Matthew 8–9 and cannot, therefore, underlie 11:4–6. This will have major implications for our assessment of whether a Wisdom Christology is operative in these chapters as a whole.

---

[111] Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 357.

[112] Loren Fischer, "Can this be the Son of David?" pages 82–97 in *Jesus and the Historian*, edited by F.T. Trotter (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967); Klaus Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments," *NTS* 20, (1973/4), 1–44; Denis C. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism and the Son of David," *HTR* 68 (1975), 235–252 and "The Therapeutic Son of David: an Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic," *NTS* 24 (1977/8), 392–410.

[113] The bowls in fact date from around 600 C.E.

[114] *Messiah*, 96–109.

[115] See Novakovic, *Messiah*, 104.

2. *The Status of John (Matt 11:7–15)*

The narrative proceeds to Jesus' assessment of John and his relation to the kingdom of heaven. The debates over the precise meaning of the rhetorical questions that introduce this section (11:7–9) need not concern us.[116] Two points are of significance, however. First, it may be significant that Jesus asks the crowd, "Why [or "what"] did you go out to the wilderness (εἰς τὴν ἔρημον) [to see]."[117] This obviously connects with the citation of Mal 3:1 in verse 10, providing it is related back to the description of John's ministry in 3:3. This fact suggests that the reference is intended to carry eschatological significance. Second, the questions come to their climax in verse 9: "A prophet? Yes, I tell you, even more than a prophet." The discussion is concerned to highlight the unique status of John as "the messenger," the new Elijah, and this only makes sense if the concern is an eschatological one. The discussion of John, then, also seems concerned to foreground the present time as being eschatological.

The quotation from Mal 3:1 (and Exodus 23:20: see below) leads in to the statements in verse 11 that "among those born of women there has arisen no-one greater than John the Baptist but the smallest (μικρότερος) in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." There are three general options put forward for the significance of μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. 1) It may refer to Jesus as the one who is younger than John.[118] 2) It may refer to those who will be in the future kingdom so that the statement "is contrasting the present state of the greatest of men with the future state of the least in the coming kingdom."[119] 3) It could refer to those now in the kingdom of heaven, so that John himself is understood as being excluded from the kingdom.

The first of these possibilities seems unlikely: it is hard to imagine Matthew portraying Jesus as the lesser one or the least, although, as shall be seen below, there may be a subtle connection here with the parables of chapter 13. This leaves the second and third options. It may be wise to heed the verdict of Luz that "a precise interpretation

---

[116] For a full discussion of this, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:246–249.

[117] 11:7. See the discussion of the grammar and syntax of this verse in Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 136 and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:247.

[118] Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1963), 32.

[119] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:251. These comments are summarising the views of J.C. O'Neill, *Jesus the Messiah: Six Lectures on the Ministry of Jesus* (London, 1980), 10–11. See also Verseput, *Rejection*, 87–89.

of the logion remains difficult."[120] Nevertheless, Lybæk has noted the redactional alteration of the word order in Matthew, whereby μείζων is removed from its initial position in the first clause (as witnessed by Luke 7:28a) and shifted to near the end of the phrase, creating a structural parallel with the second clause, in which μείζων is also found near the end:

> The result is a structure whereby the first sentence as a whole has the meaning of a superlative which the second superlative stands in relation to, and is contrasted with . . . In this construction, ὁ μικρότερος is to be understood in relation to the previous sentence (no one is greater than John, but the least is greater than him in the βασιλεία). Therefore ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν is no longer to be understood as an attribute to ὁ μικρότερος, but as the presence of a new reality which goes beyond human measure.[121]

Lybæk's point, fundamentally, is that the contrast is no longer between those born of woman and those in the kingdom (she reconstructs the sense of the second clause as "but the least [of those born of woman] in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he") but rather between those who are in and those who are not in the kingdom.[122] The emphasis, then, falls on the nature of the kingdom and the status of its occupants, with John serving as the point of comparison, representing as he does the greatest of humanity.

Lybæk also notes the insertion by Matthew of the opening verb ἐγήγερται (a perfect form), but does not develop the significance of this as she might have. In the Lukan version, both clauses have the verb evstin, but in Matthew's account the opening clause is now presented in the perfect tense. This shift seems to have largely been ignored by commentators but seems to me to suggest an important temporal issue: by contrasting the verb tenses, the Matthean account draws attention to the present tense of the second clause ("there *has not* arisen one greater than John . . . in the kingdom, the least *is* greater than he"), suggesting that the kingdom is a present reality, an interpretation that is consistent with the verses that follow.

Verse 12 is, of course, one of the most opaque verses in the New Testament, with discussion centring on whether βιάζεται is middle or pas-

---

[120] Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 140.

[121] Lybæk, *Old and New*, 176.

[122] Lybæk moves then to the conclusion that the texts contrasts this age with the age to come, suggesting that this point should be appreciated within the "already/not yet" of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος motif. (p. 177). The latter comment is helpful, but it is not clear to me how she came to the first part of the conclusion.

sive and whether its meaning is linked to the cognate βιάζεται, which occurs immediately after. Most of this discussion is of little importance for the present study, although it seems to me that the pejorative associations of βιάζομαι and of βιασταὶ.[123] require that we read the verse as "the kingdom of heaven suffers violence and violent men seize it." What is of more interest is the fact that the kingdom is depicted as having experienced this "from (ἀπὸ) the days of John the Baptist." This reading is consistent with the context of Matthew 11–12, with its emphasis on the rejection of the Messiah and his kingdom, and with that of the gospel as a whole, with its depiction of that rejection ultimately becoming violent. Here, the point of note is that the kingdom is depicted as having been a reality since John began his work as a forerunner.

This idea is further developed by the depiction of John as Elijah in verse 14. This verse alludes back to the citation of Mal 3:1 in verse 10, a citation that most would agree is a hybrid of Mal 3:1 and Ex 23:20.[124] Within the context of Malachi, Elijah is portrayed as an eschatological figure,[125] and even if there was no widespread or unified expectation of his return as a messianic forerunner in the time of Jesus,[126] such an understanding of Elijah clearly underpins what is said in this verse. Again, the effect is to foreground the sense of the present time as the eschatological one, the time of salvation.

Verse 15 ends this section with the phrase "He who has ears, let him hear." This is the first occurrence in Matthew's gospel of this phrase, which will recur in the parables of chapter 13. The words allude back to Isaiah 6:9, Jeremiah 5:21 and Ezekiel 12:2, in which those who have ears but do not hear are mentioned. On first reading, then, it simply seems to be suggesting that the hearer is to pay real attention to his words and to seek to genuinely understand their import. In chapter 13, however, the phrase occurs in verses 9 and 43 and is given a deeper meaning by the discussion of Jesus' use of parables in 13:10–17. In this discussion the disciples are told that it has been given them (δέδοται) to know (γνῶναι) the secrets (μυστήρια) of the kingdom of heaven. The vocabulary seems remarkably similar to that seen in the texts we have already studied, especially that of *4QInstruction*, although the reference to the kingdom of heaven sets this apart and draws on Matthew's distinctive categories.

---

[123] See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:256 and Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 140–2.
[124] See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:249–250; Lybæk, *New and Old*, 138–148.
[125] See Mal 4:5.
[126] See Lybæk's footnote (19) in *New and Old*, 142.

The emphasis falls on the divine "gift" of knowledge, an idea further developed in the application of the adjective "blessed" to the ears and eyes in 13:16. This reference is not simply to the body of knowledge they have received, but also to the (surely divine) transformation of their eyes and ears, since they are contrasted in verses 13 and 14 with those who have eyes and ears but do not see or hear. All of this is made explicitly eschatological by the following verse, which speaks of the prophets and righteous men of the past who longed to see and hear these things.[127]

This apocalyptic aspect of Matthew 13—and here, surely, we are justified in using the term, since it denotes revelatory ideas—has been highlighted by David Orton.[128] He comments:

> For it is not only the parables that the disciples understand, but to them it is "given" to know the "*mysteries*" of the kingdom (13:11)…All this is in contrast to "them" (v. 11) who do *not* understand and do not see and hear (v. 13) and whose blind inability to understand is in specific fulfilment of Scripture. This, then, is an eschatological moment that merits its own full formula quotation (vv. 14, 15).[129]

Orton goes on to note the frequency with which forms of the verb συνίημι/συνίω, meaning *to understand*, occurs in Matthew 13: six out of nine occurrences in Matthew occur in this chapter,[130] which is, of course, concerned with "the kingdom." This fact points to the central importance of "understanding" in chapter 13 and its association with the eschatological kingdom. Comparing the language with that used in Daniel 11–12, and speaking in particular of 13:51ff., Orton concludes:

> We have already noted that Matthew sees the blindness of the opponents of Jesus as the eschatological fulfilment of the scriptures (13:14f.). My suggestion is that he probably also sees the understanding of the disciples as the eschatological fulfilment of the scripture, namely Daniel 11 and 12, identifying the disciples with the *maskîlîm*.[131]

It is worth noting that this apocalyptic teaching in Matthew 13 reflects the two dimensions of the revealing of wisdom seen in previous chapters: on one hand, there is a revealer-figure who teaches and proclaims divine

---

[127] Robert Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man*, 74–5, notes the ways in which the Matthean redaction emphasises the inability of those outside the group to understand the parables.

[128] Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSS 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

[129] Ibid., 143.

[130] Ibid., 143.

[131] Orton, *The Understanding Scribe*, 145.

truths; on the other, there is an absolute requirement for the miraculous enabling of understanding, without which those truths will fall on deaf ears.[132] There is a similarity here, in particular, with the depiction of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: in both cases, the identity and status of the revealer-figure is hidden to those who have not been divinely enabled to grasp them.

The reader of Matthew, then, sensitive to the development of the phrase referring to the one who has "ears to hear" in chapter 13 can see the first hints emerging in 11:15 of an emphasis on the eschatological revelation of knowledge to a remnant within an unfaithful parent group. The eschatological significance of John the Baptist is closely connected to this idea.

3. *The Opposition of this Generation (Matt 11:16–19)*

The short section 11:16–19 continues to develop the idea of the present time as the eschatological one, while also beginning to make explicit the "opposition" theme of the gospel. The work of Lövestam[133] has demonstrated the pejorative associations of the phrase "this generation," so that we are immediately conscious of this theme of opposition to God. Various interpretations have been made of the simile that Jesus uses: some see Jesus and John as the children whose call is declined,[134] while others see "this generation" as the ones who call.[135] Problematic to the first of these interpretations are two facts: first, it is *this generation* that are "like children calling" and, second, the order of John the ascetic and then Jesus found in the interpretation (11:18–19) is incompatible with the call of the children which has *dancing* first and *mourning* second. Thus, the latter interpretation should be favoured, that it is the generation who call out the words of verse 17.[136] The central point of parable and interpretation, then, is essentially that *this generation* moan, "You never play our game!"

---

[132] Cf. also Matthew 16:17.

[133] E. Lövestam, *Jesus and "This Generation": A New Testament Study* (ConBNT 25; Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1995).

[134] So Verseput, *Rejection*, 113–114; T.W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, (London: SCM, 1964), 70, J. Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, (Regensburg: Pustet, 1956), 194; E. Schweitzer, *Matthew*, 264.

[135] Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 2:262.

[136] The objection of Verseput (*Rejection*, 113), that this casts John and Jesus in an active role in the interpretation and a passive role in the parable does not stand examination, for in both parable and interpretation the act of speech/denunciation is the key action being performed. This generation are thus "active" in both.

Contextually, what is important is that they say this about two figures already presented within Matthew 11 as eschatological figures, who are part of the plan and work of God. This, as we shall see, is developed in chapter 12, where Matthew makes explicit that this rejection of Jesus and John is a rejection of God's eschatological work. The children of this generation resent Jesus and John not playing their games (the rules of which seem always to be changing!), but in truth they are rejecting God's way of playing.

The section ends with a statement that most scholars see as reflecting Matthean redaction: "Wisdom is proved right by her works (τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς)." The parallel phrase in Luke reads "children" instead of "works." The probable alteration in Matthew has the effect of reminding the reader of 11:2, which in turn refers back to the miracles of chapters 8–9. As we have seen, Novakovic has argued that these miracle-stories, in which Matthew emphasises that Jesus is the Son of David, are significant primarily because of their eschatological significance. It is only as a consequence of this that they have any significance in revealing Jesus messianic identity. The phrase "wisdom is proved right by her works," therefore takes on a distinctly eschatological hue, one that yet again foregrounds the eschatological nature of the present time rather than the person of Jesus himself.

This understanding of "works" is borne out by the subsequent section (11:20–24) in which Jesus denounces the cities in which most of his miracles had been performed. The key again is the theme of opposition and blindness, a failure to understand the significance of the works, but now a new element begins to be introduced: the surprisingly positive, if hypothetical, reception of Jesus actions by the pagan cities. The point, only hinted at here but developed below, is one of reversal: those expected to be receptive are blind and those expected to be blind are receptive. Within the structure of chapter 11, this prepares the way for the key section of verses 25–30.

4. *The Miracle of Revelation and the Easy Yoke (Matt 11:25–30)*

As Lybæk notes,[137] Matthew 11:25–30 holds a unique place in the gospel, being both introduced and followed by the phrase "at that time." While the phrase is transitional, it both unites and separates units of material

[137] *New and Old*, 149.

and is used only three times in the gospel.[138] The use of the phrase gives a sense of structural importance to these verses: they are at the heart of chapters 11–12, just as these chapters are at the narrative heart of the gospel as a whole, at least as far as the central thread of the rejection of Jesus is concerned. The theme of "revelation" is thus at the very centre of Matthew's narrative.

The question of the unity of these verses and their place within the hypothetical Q document need not concern us, except insofar as verses 28–30 are unique to Matthew.[139] Either he has composed this material himself, or he has maintained tradition not maintained by the other gospels. From a compositional view, the importance lies in the mutual light cast on each part of the section by the other.

The opening thanksgiving is interesting in describing God as "Lord of heaven and earth." The phrase obviously presents God as sovereign over all of creation, but it also reminds the reader of the kind of view of reality common to the apocalyptic writing, namely that there is a heavenly dimension to existence that is not visible but is real nonetheless, which when comprehended casts the reality that greets our senses into a fresh light. If this is correct, then the opening thanksgiving prepares the reader (or hearer) for an idea of revelation that is appropriate to those writings.

The reason for the praise is the fact that God himself has hidden "these things" from the wise and the learned and revealed them to little children (νηπίοις). In the context, "these things" must, initially at least,[140] refer to the apprehension of the significance of the works of Jesus. Most commentators acknowledge that this verse represents an inversion of Wisdom thinking: the wise and learned are no longer those who properly grasp the truth, which instead is grasped by the "babes," an idea that corresponds to the "simple" of Proverbs. But as we have already noted, Luz and Lybæk have argued against this idea corresponding to the apocalyptic idea of wisdom revealed to a remnant, instead seeing this as open to all whose hearts are not hard. The problem with this view is that it fails to take into account the active role of God as the one who hides and reveals. When read in conjunction with Matthew 13, where

---

[138] The third occurrence is in 14:1.

[139] Most scholars agree that 11:25–27 is from Q, while 28–30 are from M. See Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 48–49.

[140] Once the reader encounters the reference to "all things" in 11:27, this sense may be expanded appropriately.

the same idea is presented in terms of God enabling certain eyes and ears to understand, and thus "blessing" them, it is difficult to get round the fact that this text presents God as actively enabling a certain group to understand a certain body of truth and actively preventing others from gaining access to that truth. The welcome to all who will come to Jesus in 11:28–30 should not be taken to diminish this strong emphasis on the divine opening of eyes and ears, strongly reminiscent as it is of the concepts studied in previous chapters. The comment of Luz,[141] that the Father does not reveal himself to the religious elite, whether of apocalyptic, Essene or scribal type, misses the key point that if there is any elitism seen in the apocalyptic texts—at least those studied in this book—it is solely based on the possession of revealed wisdom.

The use of aorist tenses for "hidden" and "revealed" conveys the sense that the present time is that in which this revelation has now taken place. This represents an important departure from the constituent works of *1 Enoch*, where the narrative setting requires that this revelation is a future event (although to the reader, of course, it is a present/past reality), but it is similar to *4QInstruction* and the way in which that text makes use of the apocalyptic idea of revelation as something that has already taken place. Within the narrative of Matthew, the significance of the tenses is made clear by verse 27, in which the Son's[142] role in this revelation is presented.

The reference to, and significance of, the mutual knowledge[143] of Father and Son is difficult to understand: probably Luz is right in seeing the point of the image being "the knowledge of like by like,"[144] implying a unique relationship between God and Jesus that is based upon who Jesus is, rather than anything he has done or experienced.[145] It is certainly striking that in 11:25–7 there is a great emphasis placed on the Father-Son relationship as key to the theme of revelation, as Kingsbury notes:

---

[141] *Matthew 8–20*, 163.

[142] Regarding the use of "Son" in this verse, see the discussion of Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 165–6.

[143] Regarding the meaning of ἐπιγνώσκει as "knows" rather than "chooses," see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:281. This discussion challenges attempts to understand the knowledge depicted in verse 27 as that of "election." The fundamental problem is that it is difficult to see how the Son "elects" the Father.

[144] Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 168.

[145] "The being of the one who knows is not an act that could be separated from the self." Luz, ibid., 168.

> The fivefold use of the word "Father" coupled with the threefold use of the term "the Son" as well as the key position in vs. 27 of the verb "to know," indicate that "knowledge" and the "personal relationship" of the Son with the Father are two prominent themes.[146]

This is suggestive of a very high Christology indeed, and it is noteworthy that it is in such a "Son-Christology" rather than in an obvious reference to Wisdom that the act of revelation is given its foundation. Witherington suggests that this knowledge of Father and Son is modelled on the intimacy of Wisdom and God,[147] but provides no evidence in support. In the absence of such evidence, we are left with the more obvious connection that Matthew would have us make: Jesus' revelatory ability stems from his unique relationship with God ("no-one knows the Father except the Son"). To return to Luz's point, that the stress seems to be on "the knowledge of like by like," the fact that 11:27 refers to the exclusivity of the Father's knowledge of the Son, as well as that of the Son's knowledge of the Father, seems intended to stress the absolute uniqueness of this relationship and thus the inability of anyone other than the Father's Son being capable of filling such a role. It seems, then, that rather than affirming the Wisdom Christology alleged by Witherington and others, these verses affirm the kind of "Son of God" Christology outlined by Kingsbury.[148]

Whether this is the best understanding of the text or not, these difficult verses obviously reach their purpose in the final clause, which refers to Jesus' subsequent revelation to "those to whom he wills to reveal." Again, it is impossible to avoid the centrality of the idea of an elect group, chosen by the Son to be recipients of revelation. Moreover, it is striking that the construction suggests that what is revealed is nothing less than a knowledge of God himself. Such an idea is strongly reminiscent of 1QS 4:22, in which the elect are given "knowledge of the Most High," a point that becomes more significant when we appreciate that this reference leads in to line 23, where the same elect are given "all the glory of Adam." The obvious association intended by the Community Rule is that intimate knowledge of God is a fundamental part of the recovered "glory of Adam." We have already seen that such ideas may well be operative in the Sermon on the Mount: the presence of a reference here to the revealing of knowledge of God himself suggests

---

[146] Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Kingdom, Christology*, 64.
[147] *Jesus the Sage*, 350.
[148] In *Matthew: Structure, Kingdom, Christology* as a whole.

that the concept of restored creation, of the recovered glory of Adam, while not explicit in Matthew 11–12 may nevertheless be present in the background.

Since the important works of M. Jack Suggs[149] and Celia Deutsch,[150] verses 28–30 have been understood by many scholars as containing sapiential motifs borrowed primarily from Sirach 6:18–22, 28–30 and 51:23–27 in order to build a "Wisdom Christology."[151] The primary points of correspondence are the terms "yoke" and "toil," and the phrase "find rest." As both Verseput[152] and, in a more influential study, Stanton[153] have noted, this is a rather slender correspondence. Moreover, Stanton points out the absence of two key ideas of the Matthean text in the Sirach passages: the idea of those who are "weary and heavy laden" and the idea of Jesus as the one who is "meek and lowly." The response of Witherington to the first of these criticisms is to suggest that Stanton has ignored the heavily sapiential character of the rest of Matthew 11.[154] As we have seen, however, this reflects his flawed assessment of the significance of Jesus' therapeutic ministry as "Solomonic." The second criticism, regarding the absence of the two key ideas, is not addressed by Witherington.

Despite Stanton's comments, others continue to see some kind of allusion to Sirach here, notably Lybæk,[155] who surprisingly makes no attempt to respond to Stanton's criticism. Her understanding of the relationship with the Sirach texts, however, is rather more subtle than previous works, understanding the Matthean text to be making no more than "implied allusion"[156] to them. This is probably a fair assessment, since the common presence of two nouns and one verb at the heart of these passages is, while a slender correspondence, still more than can be accounted for by chance, particularly when it is noted that they occur in just two verses in Sirach 51:26–27. However, if the correspondence is simply that of implied allusion then surely we must be especially cautious

---

[149] M. Jack Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970).

[150] *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25–30.*

[151] This idea predated the work of Deutsch and Suggs. See the summary of earlier contributions in Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 366–8, and also in the appendix to the present work.

[152] *Rejection*, 145.

[153] *The Gospel for a New People*, 369.

[154] *Jesus the Sage*, 361.

[155] *New and Old*, 148–58.

[156] Ibid., 150.

in identifying significant theological points being made through subtle alterations of the text alluded to.

Specifically, we must ask: are Lybæk and the others who follow this approach justified in attaching the significance they do to the fact that Jesus speaks of "*my* yoke" rather than "*wisdom's* yoke"? Does this justifiably indicate that "he is speaking not simply as a teacher of wisdom, but implicitly as wisdom personified"?[157] Even if the allusion were more clearly demonstrable, we would still have to be cautious about drawing such conclusions in a gospel which seeks so explicitly to draw attention to Jesus' teaching: the shift to "*my* yoke" in that case could reflect the concern to give pre-eminence to Jesus' own teaching or his interpretations of the Law. In the absence of such clear allusion even greater caution is called for, especially given the lack of a consistent effort to present Jesus as Wisdom Incarnate elsewhere in the gospel. We may also note, at this point, the words of David Orton concerning a similar alteration to first-person language in 23:34:

> In Sirach, the scribe and the figure of Wisdom speak in unison; in particular, Ben Sira himself in his aspirations to prophetic inspiration is indistinguishable in tone from the similarly inspired figure of Wisdom in ch. 24…perhaps like Ben Sira the inspired Teacher in Matthew's Gospel naturally uses first-person wisdom language. It is difficult to be sure.[158]

Orton's words raise the possibility that the language here may simply reflect the close association of Jesus with the wisdom that he reveals: he speaks in unison with this wisdom, rather than actually *being* Wisdom. Such a possibility would seem to be justified by Sirach 51:23–28, in which Ben Sira's own wisdom, shared with those who come to his school, is described in first-person language that could easily be placed on the lips of Wisdom herself.

If there is not a Wisdom-Christology operative in these verses, why do they make such an implied allusion to Sirach 6 and 51? One possibility is that, in fact, such allusions are not of primary importance within the text. This is the view of Davies and Allison, who see the background of Matthew 11:25–30 lying instead in traditions associated with Moses:

> As we shall argue, the declaration about Father and Son knowing each other is grounded in Exodus 33.12–13, where God knows Moses and Moses prays that he might know God; and the promise of rest in Mt 11.28

[157] Ibid., 151.
[158] *The Understanding Scribe*, 154.

> is modelled upon Exod 33.14. Further, in deeming himself to be meek (v. 29) Jesus is taking up a chief characteristic of Moses . . . and in referring to his 'yoke' (v. 29) he is using a term often applied to the law which was given through Moses.[159]

The main criticism against this argument is that Davies and Allison argue that "the differences are as important as the similarities," yet those differences become so frequent—indeed, in *each* of the points of correspondence, a difference may be seen—that one wonders whether or not the comparison is valid at all. After all, there must be substantial similarity for any allusion to work.

In my view, the wisdom allusions of this text remain the most obvious, but we should be careful of building too much upon them. I would suggest that the most likely explanation of the allusions is parallel to the phenomenon discussed in previous chapters of this study: once a shift has been made towards an apocalyptic understanding of revealed wisdom, the concept assimilates forms and motifs appropriate to the sapiential literature. Here, the assimilation of language found in Sirach is a natural corollary of the idea of revealed wisdom found in verses 25–27. Acknowledging this, however, does not absolve us of the responsibility to be sensitive to the range of allusions that may be made to texts and traditions that lie behind even the Sirach text.

What, then, is the purpose of the images of the "toiling," of the "easy yoke," and of "rest"? Within the Sirach passages the yoke represents the idea of submission to—and service of—Wisdom, as supremely embodied within Torah. There is no sense of the term being used there to denote particular interpretations of Torah or of specific halakhic approaches: it is Torah itself *as representative of Wisdom* that is in view. The associations of the term "yoke" with Torah are reflected also in texts such as Jeremiah 5:5, 2 Baruch 41:3; further examples of Torah as an expression of Wisdom are found in Baruch 3:9; 2 Baruch 38:4; T. Levi 13:1–9. All of these reinforce the suspicion that a play on this idea of Torah as Wisdom is crucial to our text.

A further important contribution can be made to an understanding of the passage by the use of the term in Jeremiah 2:20,[160] in which Israel is described as breaking off her yoke, saying "I will not serve you."

---

[159] *Matthew*, 2:272. See, further, their comments on the text on pages 273–293. See also Dale Allison's more developed argument in *The New Moses*, 218–235, regarding which my criticisms still hold true.

[160] Similarly Jeremiah 5:5.

Lybæk[161] notes the link between this passage and Jer 6:16, in which the metaphor for service is not the "yoke" but the "way": "I will not walk in it," Israel says. The importance of this link is that the latter passage describes walking in "the good way" (which Israel has now rejected) as bringing "rest for your souls." The "yoke," then, represents more than just Torah: as Jer 2:20 makes clear, it represents proper service of God ("I will not serve *you*") and submission to him. This service is, of course, closely tied to Torah-observance; nevertheless, the emphasis falls upon the relationship between God and his people, the relational aspect of the submission.

This submission, according to Jer 6:16, brings "rest." In context, this rest must be representative of the covenant blessings, most conspicuously that of dwelling at peace within the land,[162] since the surrounding verses speak of the loss of that very thing. Such an idea may well be at the heart of the "rest" imagery in Matthew 11:28. Blaine Charette[163] has made a strong case for the idea of "reward" in Matthew as drawing on Deuteronomic promises of possession of the land. Charette sees these promises as taking on an eschatological hue in Matthew: they anticipate the renewal of creation and the possession of the new earth by the elect. The fact that Jesus' promise of rest in 11:28 follows so closely a discussion of the judgement to come (11:22–24), and this in the context of a wider chapter so concerned with eschatology suggests that Charette's idea of eschatologised Deuteronomic motifs may well be at the heart of the image of rest.[164]

If Charette's proposition is not persuasive, the Jeremiah 2:20/6:16 background to Matt 11:28–30 still suggests that what we have in Jesus' words is an image of finding true blessing through service of and submission to God. The use of the possessive μου can now be appreciated: Jesus is the one who truly shows how God is to be served, an idea that implicitly suggests that his revelation is a better guide than Torah. The description of the recipients of this invitation as "all who toil and are burdened," suggests that they are pursuing this rest in the wrong way,

---

[161] *New and Old*, 156–157.

[162] Cf. Deut 28 & 30.

[163] In *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel.*

[164] See also B. Charette, "'To Proclaim Liberty to the Captives': Matthew 11:28–30 in the Light of OT Prophetic Expectation," *NTS* 38 (1992), 290–97. This article has been criticised by Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher*, 303, for failing to pick up on the obviously didactic significance of μανθάνειν and for importing "quasi-political" connotations instead. While Byrskog's main point is well-taken, he may, however, have failed to understand the essentially eschatological thrust of Charette's proposal.

only becoming more burdened. In view of the Matthean context—the growing sense of hostility and particularly the Sabbath controversies in chapter 12—we should probably see a reference to Pharisaic practice here. This suspicion is reinforced when we compare the image of Jesus' yoke being "easy" and his burden "light" with the language of 23:4, where the Pharisees place "heavy loads" on men's shoulders.[165]

To conclude the discussion of this section: at the heart of a section of Matthew's gospel which constantly foregrounds the idea of the present time as eschatological, this section in turn foregrounds the idea of revelation. This revelation is to an elect group chosen by the Son to receive such knowledge, whose reception involves a divine opening of ears and eyes. This idea of revelation parallels that seen in our study of the Enochic Testament and *4QInstruction*. Moreover, the suggestion that the imparted knowledge is nothing less than a knowledge of God himself is conceptually similar to 1QS 4:22, where this knowledge represents the recovered glory of Adam and fits within a schema of restored creation.

5. *The Servant (Matt 12:17–21)*

The description of Jesus withdrawing from "that place," continuing to heal those who are sick and warning them not to tell who he is (12:15–16), leads into the lengthy citation of Isaiah 42:1–4.[166] This quotation is the longest in the gospel, a fact that alone would cause the reader to regard it as important. Also, it seems to represent a mixed text-type, following neither LXX nor MT consistently, and departing from both at points. Commentators differ on whether the text had a pre-history or whether Matthew has deliberately drawn from different text types and freely altered even these. This question is linked to a further one: has the citation been altered to fit its context, or has the context been shaped around the citation? Ultimately, given the lack of clear criteria for judgement, answers to these questions are subjective, as Verseput notes.[167]

What is impressive, and more clearly demonstrable, is the extent to which each line of the citation can easily be linked to the context of

---

[165] I have not addressed, at this stage, the significance of the language of Jesus being "gentle" (πραΰς) and lowly in heart (ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδία). This will be discussed below in the context of the citation of Isaiah 42:1–4.

[166] A thorough discussion of Matthew's use of these verses is found in Richard Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* (SNTSMS 123; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[167] *Rejection*, 194.

chapters 11–12, particularly in the sense that these chapters bring into focus certain themes running through the whole book. Also striking is the extent to which the use of aorist tenses reinforces the idea of the "pre-temporal"[168] purpose of God, and thus the sense of eschatological fulfilment.

The use of παῖς to translate **רבע** is sometimes taken as an allusion to the baptism narrative.[169] The fact, however, that the term occurs in LXX translation of Isaiah 42:1 suggests that we should be cautious in making such pronouncements, as does the fact that an allusion to the baptism narrative would have been more likely to have used υἱός (cf. Matthew 3:17). The language of the parallel phrase, however (ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου· θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου) is suggestive of such an allusion: it is difficult to see how ὁ ἀγαπητός could function as a translation of **בחירי**.[170] The verb forms in both of these parallel phrases are aorist, a shift from LXX. The use of the aorist ἠρέτισα ("I have chosen," from αἱρετίζω) in place of ἀντιλήμψομαι ("I will uphold")[171] is of particular importance: this alteration roots the whole citation in the election of God, retaining the sense of **בחירי** that would otherwise have been lost by the translation ὁ ἀγαπητός μου and, thus, giving the reader a new sense of the significance of the baptism of Jesus within the counsel of God: the coming of Jesus, his baptism and his subsequent ministry represent the fulfilment of God's long-established plans. The reference to the gift of the Spirit in the next line maintains this baptismal allusion; it is interesting to note that here the tenses have been changed in the opposite direction, with the aorist of LXX (ἔδωκα) being replaced by the future form (θήσω). The effect is a much sharper sense of the present reality being a fulfilment of past prophecy.

While the Spirit-reference is given a strong sense of being a baptismal allusion by the alteration of the previous line, it also connects with the Beelzeboul narrative of 12:22–37, which immediately follows this citation. This fact reinforces the eschatological sense of that narrative, as we shall see. The language of τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in 12:18 connects with both 11:20–24 and 12:41–42, suggesting a ministry that goes beyond the ethnic borders of Israel and developing a theme that will ultimately climax

---

[168] This phrase is used by Verseput, *Rejection*, 196.

[169] So Jeremias, "παις θεου," *TDNT* (1967), 5:700–1.

[170] **בחיר** is always translated in LXX as ἐκλεκτός, apart from in Isaiah 65:22, where it is rendered as λαός.

[171] This is a future middle form.

in 28:19. Such a theme is, of course, important within Deutero-Isaiah, but there it does not carry the polemic edge that it gains from its context here, namely that at least part of the reason for the Gentile mission is the rejection of the Messiah by the Jewish leaders.

Verse 19 refers to the quietness of the Servant's ministry. Some have connected this with Jesus' command to the crowds not to reveal his identity (12:16).[172] Probably the most important idea in this verse, however, is that of the refusal to pursue one's rights: οὐκ ἐρίσει, in particular, conveys such a sense,[173] and the use of ἐρίζω at the beginning of the clause probably influences the significance of the other verbs. The Servant is someone who will not loudly pursue the rights that are rightfully his. What seems of particular importance is the connection between this point and the subsequent verse, which speaks about the Servant's tender treatment of "bruised reeds" and "smouldering wicks." These verses are obviously metaphorical: according to Novakovic,[174] they refer primarily to Jesus gentle treatment and healing of the sick, though also more generally to the compassion of his ministry. It seems to me that these verses cast light upon the idea of 11:29, in which Jesus' gentleness (πραΰς) and humility (ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδία) lie at the heart of his promise that his yoke is easy: as one not driven by his own rights and by self-interest, the servant treats with tenderness those who are imperfect. So, too, in 11:29, it is as the one who is gentle and lowly that Jesus promises the tender treatment of all who would come to him. The reader of Matthew's gospel, aware of the status of its central character (as demonstrated not least by the voice at the baptism), surely cannot see anything but the forsaking of status and rights in the application of the adjective ταπεινὸς to Jesus in 11:29. The link, then, seems obvious: unmotivated by his own self-interest, Jesus will treat with tenderness those all too aware of their failure to find rest in their own toil.

The promise of tenderness is given "until he leads to victory justice (ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν)." The phrase conveys the sense that the ministry of the Servant is moving towards an eschatological goal: the language of "judgement" or "justice" connects with the language of 11:20–4 and 12:37, 41, 42, and indeed conceptually with the whole of

---

[172] So Verseput, *Rejection*, 198.

[173] See B. Gärtner "The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew," *ST* 8 (1955), 20–21. See also, R.H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 113.

[174] *Messiah*, 142–4.

the Beelzeboul controversy (12:22–37) and the signs discussion (12:38–45). The phrase also leads into the final statement, that "in his name (τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ) the nations will put their hope." The text seems to follow LXX rather than MT, using ὀνόματι rather than translate תורה. This may be intended to recall the naming of Jesus in 1:23&25; whether or not this is the case, the verse certainly has the effect of making the Servant central to the eschatological hope, which again involves "the nations." Once again, a link to the final verses of the gospel (esp. 28:19) may also be suggested to the sensitive reader.

The citation of Isaiah 42:1–4, then, provides a Scriptural foundation for the eschatological nature of the events taking place in Jesus' ministry and for the character of that ministry. It also develops the contrast of the rejection of Jesus by Israel and the acceptance of him by the nations, reinforcing the fact that those who will accept Jesus teaching represent a chosen minority or remnant among the people of Israel and justifying also the inclusion of Gentiles in that group. It is worth noting, in conclusion, that this same text was an important source for the author of the Parables of Enoch, in his development of the Chosen Son of Man, a point discussed above, in chapter 2.

6. *The Beelzeboul Controversy (Matt 12:22–37)*

The dominant idea throughout the Beelzeboul controversy in 12:22–37 is that of the activity of the Spirit as indicating the presence of the kingdom and thus the eschatological period. The key verse within this is 12:28, in which the Matthean version of the story speaks of Jesus driving out demons "by the Spirit of God," by contrast to the Lukan "by the finger of God." The difference between the two accounts creates an important connection with the quotation from Isaiah 42:1–4, in which the Spirit is put upon the Servant: the point is essentially that Jesus' practice of exorcism is indicative of the eschatological character of his ministry.

This idea is further developed by the image of the strong man tied up in 12:29. The point of the image is obvious: it is only because Satan is bound that Jesus is able to plunder him, liberating the people who are his possessions.[175] Some have seen the story of the temptation as providing the background to this verse, understanding the victory of Jesus

[175] See Luz, *Mathhew 8–20*, 204–5; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:342–3.

in the wilderness as representing the moment of binding,[176] although Verseput argues that "an insurmountable objection to this view is evident in the nature of the temptation itself, since Jesus' faithfulness to the Father is tested and proven, but he himself does not go on the attack. His success in withstanding the trial can hardly be said to have harmed Satan."[177] Nevertheless, the narrative of the temptation is introduced by a reference to the Spirit (4:1, note also 3:16), and it does constitute the most explicit confrontation between Jesus and Satan within the gospel up to this point, so perhaps we should not rule it out with too much haste. Primarily, though, the importance of the discussion here is that Satan has been bound by the Spirit and that this represents a crucial aspect of God's eschatological work. This undergirds the strength of the warning in 12:31–32 against blaspheming the Holy Spirit: in keeping with the whole of these two chapters, Jesus is pointing away from his own personal significance towards that of the time in which his ministry occurs, the time of the Spirit's work and thus of God's kingdom. Those who speak ill of the Spirit are rejecting the very eschatological work of God.

The imagery of this section is categorised by Sim as "apocalyptic,"[178] a view with which most would concur. It is important, though, to note the way in which it contributes to a developing dualism that relates also to the possession of revealed wisdom: the exorcistic work of Jesus is part of the eschatological binding of Satan and overturning of his power, just as the revelatory work of Jesus is part of the eschatological age. Those who are freed from Satan's power are free to receive the revelation and rest that Jesus offers.

Indeed, it is striking that this dualism is developed in 12:33–35 in the image of the two trees. This image, which is essentially a *mashal* and thus has sapiential associations, conveys a single primary idea: outward actions, particularly those of speech (verse 34), express the reality of one's nature. By speaking against the Spirit, the words of the Pharisees have testified to their evil nature (verses 34 & 35): they are a brood of

---

[176] So T. Zahn, *Matthäus*, 459; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (Trans. S.H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1954), 98–9; G.R. Beasley-Murray, "Jesus and the Spirit," in *Melanges biblique en homage au R.P. Beda Rigaux*, edited by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux (Gembloux: Ducolot, 1970), 471. More recently, N.T Wright has developed this idea in the context of Historical Jesus research in *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), 457–459.

[177] Verseput, *Rejection*, 410.

[178] David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 77–9.

vipers, incapable of good speech. Thus, Matthew's narrative sets the Pharisees' actions within a dualistic context where their rejection of Jesus' actions and teaching reflects their belonging to Satan's kingdom.

Once again, therefore, there is a close link between the apocalyptic construal of reality and the fusion of elements from both apocalyptic and sapiential genres: Jesus' revelatory activity, the wisdom that he openly offers to give, is strongly set within an apocalyptic context that centres on dualistic ideas and the existence of a demonic reality. It may be worth noting the fact that the overall impression of this passage is one in which the kingdom has not yet fully arrived: the demonic activity, and Jesus' conflict with it, reflect an inaugurated rather than a realised eschatology. The hope of a world free of evil, in which creation has been renewed, remains a hope for the future.

7. *More than Jonah; More than Solomon (Matt 12:38–42)*

The next section of these chapters takes up once more the pejorative idea of the "generation." With what may or may not be irony, given the preceding miracle accounts and the eschatological claims of Jesus[179] the Pharisees and Scribes[180] ask for a sign. The response of Jesus is to promise only one sign, that of Jonah, and whereas the Lukan account focuses on the significance of Jonah as a sign to the Ninevites (Lk 11:30), the Matthean account develops the loose parallel between Jonah's sojourn in the belly of the fish and Jesus' sojourn in the heart of the earth.

The key idea within this section, however, is that "something more than Jonah is here," (12:41), an idea paralleled by a second idea, that "something greater than Solomon is here" (12:42). As with 12:6, a neuter form occurs: here it is πλεῖον. Few would dispute that the reference is in some sense Christological,[181] but the neuter form leaves open the possibility here (as in verse 6) that the significance is not so much in Jesus himself, but in the activity of God taking place in the ministry of Jesus.

---

[179] Note the comment of Verseput, *Rejection*, 254–5, that "The first gospel strategically positions the request for a sign at the end of Jesus' counter-argument, thereby displaying it as a brazen response given in the face of Jesus' most unambiguous eschatological claim."

[180] The solidarity of the two groups is a striking development in the Matthean narrative.

[181] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:358, note that in Matthew the reference is explicitly Christological but discuss various possibilities for what the phrase may have meant within the pre-Matthean tradition and to Jesus himself. C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 46–47, saw it as a reference to the kingdom. R.H. Fuller, similarly, saw the term as referring to the preaching of the kingdom, in *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (Studies in Biblical Theology 12; London: SCM Press, 1954), 34–5.

We can now see how appropriate such an understanding of the neuter form is, having noted the emphasis of the preceding sections, especially the Beelzeboul controversy, as being on the character of the present time as eschatological rather than on Jesus own person.

In both 12:41 and 42, the comparisons are to figures acknowledged by those outside the circle of Israel—Jonah and Solomon—and the images draw attention to the negative comparison between those of "this generation" and the outsiders (the Ninevites and the Queen of the South) who will arise to condemn them.[182] The occurrence of Solomon as one of the figures of comparison is used by Witherington[183] as part of his argument for a thoroughgoing Wisdom-Christology. As we have seen, however, such a Christology does not characterise these chapters as a whole and even here the parallel comparison with Jonah lessens the sapiential impression left by the Solomon reference.[184] More appropriate as a description of both comparisons is that both Jonah and Solomon are "revealer" figures in some sense. One is a revealer associated with the prophetic tradition while the other is a revealer associated with the wisdom tradition; both, though, reveal. Moreover, both reveal to those outside Israel.

The real significance of this section lies outside these verses. The image of something greater than Jonah and Solomon suggests a greater revelation to those outside Israel. Again, the place where this finds its fullest expression is in the commission in 28:19–20. Thus, the significance of these verses is indeed Christological, but not in the sense that it is often taken as being. Rather the significance is in pointing to the present time as eschatological and to the contrast between those who should be in the kingdom, but who are rejecting the Christ (and his teaching), and those outside, who are being brought in by accepting his teaching. As part of Matthew's narrative of conflict, this section once again reinforces the idea that those who receive Jesus' revealed wisdom are a minority or remnant that now includes, significantly, Gentiles.

Conclusions to the study of Matthew 11–12

At the beginning of this section of the chapter, I suggested that the crucial question to be addressed with regard to Matthew 11–12 concerns

---

[182] Cf. Matthew 11:21–24.
[183] *Jesus the Sage*, 361.
[184] Witherington relegates the Jonah reference to a footnote. *Jesus the Sage*, 361.

the kind of wisdom that is revealed by Jesus. In addition, I suggested that it was important to recognise what his relationship to that wisdom is. It is clear that, contrary to Lybæk and Luz, the wisdom associated with Jesus is of an eschatological character, is given only to a remnant who are divinely enabled to receive it and is connected to an underlying dualism. Moreover, the requirement for such revelatory activity is suggestive of a deficiency in Torah, and the appropriation of language often associated with Torah ("yoke") has the effect of suggesting that the teaching of Jesus is now to be the central embodiment of wisdom for God's people. Attempts to see a thoroughgoing Wisdom-Christology in these chapters, however, ignore the constant emphasis of Jesus on the character of the present time as eschatological, rather than on himself. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that while Jesus is not to be identified as Wisdom Incarnate, he is undoubtedly unique as the one who reveals God himself and in doing so gives rest.

As the narrative develops into the parables of chapter 13, these themes develop. In 13:10–17, discussed above, the requirement of divine transformation is central, a reality that functions as part of the Matthean dualism.[185] Above all else, the chapter as a whole develops the idea that a remnant group are miraculously enabled to understand the truth as it is embodied in Jesus' teaching and that this is of fundamental importance in the judgement that is to come. The eschatological ideas of chapters 11–12 are thus taken up, as is the theme of obduracy, now explicitly given a theological rationale. And at the heart of all of this is the teaching, the revelation of Jesus.

Inaugurated Eschatology and Revealed Wisdom in Matthew 24–25

The final section of Matthew to be examined in detail is that of Matthew 24–25. These chapters are of obvious interest to our study because they contain two blocks of teaching widely regarded as "apocalyptic" (chapter 24:4–44 and 25:31–46) and also a block of teaching that develops the eschatological teaching of chapter 24 using *meshalim*, thus further developing the idea that Jesus is a sage (24:45–25:30). Moreover, these *meshalim* are—as shall be argued below—eschatological and, indeed, prophetic in nature. The section as a whole will cast some interesting light, therefore, on our study of how sapiential and apocalyptic elements

[185] See Sim's discussion of the dualism that underlies these parables and this chapter as a whole within the Matthean worldview. *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 78–9, 84–5.

relate to one another: if the idea of eschatologically revealed wisdom is indeed the key to understanding Matthew's development of wisdom/apocalypse, then we must surely expect to encounter it here. What will, however, prove to be of particular interest is the role played within these chapters by the destruction of the temple. That the destruction of the temple dominates these chapters will be argued below, and in light of this fact certain questions suggest themselves: Why does the future fall of the temple occupy such a large part of the wisdom revealed by Jesus? Why is it described in language usually described as "apocalyptic"? How does it relate to the eschatological scenario developed by Matthew?

Central to this section of my argument will be the fact that Matthew has highlighted the eschatological character of the fall of the temple. There is, therefore, a coordination of the events surrounding the fall of Jerusalem and of the consummation of the *eschaton*. I propose that this move highlights the eschatological character of the plotted time of the gospel in a way that is appropriate to the schema of inaugurated eschatology that has been developed in the gospel. Moreover, by relating the destruction of the temple to the criteria utilised in the judgement parables of 24:45–25:46, Matthew depicts the fall of the temple as being a consequence of the rejection of Jesus' wisdom, thus subverting the traditional material to his concern to depict Jesus as the eschatological revealer.

Matthew 24–25 in Context

Matthew 24–25 is found in the wider context of a section of the Matthean narrative that takes place within Jerusalem and that is given over to Jesus' critique or judgement of the people of Israel, and particularly their leaders. There are numerous options for how the reader should break the latter chapters of Matthew into sections, but the geographical location obviously creates a certain unity of the material from chapter 21 onwards. More specifically, some commentators have seen a unit comprising chapters 21–25. Luz groups these chapters under the heading "The final reckoning with Israel and the judgement of the community."[186] Nevertheless, as Alastair Wilson points out,[187] Luz's discussion fails to explore the possible connections between the narrative

[186] U. Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (Trans. J.B. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 117.

[187] Alistair I. Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen: A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21–25* (Paternoster Biblical Monographs; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 68.

of chapters 21–23, understood by Hagner as constituting a unit,[188] and the eschatological material of chapters 24–25, which are to all intents treated by Luz as a distinct sub-unit. Wilson himself suggests that there is an inclusio between 21:1–11 and 25:31–46, based around the idea of the coming king. He notes that Davies and Allison describe 21:1–11 as "one of many texts that recount the triumphal arrival (*parousia*) of a ruler or military hero."[189]

> There can be little doubt that 25:31 is also a report of such a *Parousia*, since we find several of the distinctive characteristics of such a report in the text: the verb of arrival (Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ), the attendant crowd (καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ), the acclamation of the king (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ).[190]

In addition, it might be noted that chapters 24–25, a unit in their own right as the last great discourse of Jesus,[191] are bound to the narrative of chapters 21–23, which take place largely in the temple, by the disciples' wonder at the buildings of the temple (24:1) and the subsequent prophecy by Jesus of their destruction.

The chapters under examination in this part of our study are, therefore, firmly placed in a context that is concerned with Jerusalem generally and, in particular, with the temple. Given that within this geographical context Jesus enters into conflict with the various official and unofficial leaders of the Jewish people, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the temple is functioning within the narrative as the symbolic heart of Israel. It becomes difficult and even artificial, therefore, to separate judgements pronounced upon the temple from judgements pronounced upon the people.

Matthew 24: An Apocalyptic Discourse?

The material in Matthew 24 reflects, in the minds of most scholars, Matthew's redaction of the material found in Mark 13. The term "apocalyptic" has been widely applied to this material; indeed, some have termed Mark 13 "an apocalypse" in its own right and have even suggested that the material there, and in the parallel accounts, were

---

[188] See D.A Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, (WBC 33B; Waco: Word, 1995), 591.

[189] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:111.

[190] Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen*, 70.

[191] See France, *Matthew*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press), 333; Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, (London: Constable, 1930), 236–249, sees this as the speech dimension of the "fifth book" of Matthew. Bacon's breakdown of the Matthean texts is represented in Allison, *The New Moses*, 295.

drawn from a pre-Christian Jewish apocalypse.[192] This latter view is largely rejected today because of the absence of certain key aspects of the apocalyptic genre, such as the visionary nature of what is described.[193] According to my discussion of the genre in chapter 1, Mark 13 and its parallels cannot be described as an apocalypse. Even the term "apocalyptic" should be applied to the material with some caution: it is hard to resist the conclusion that some scholars use the term simply because the material is eschatological and because the meanings of the two terms are, popularly, collapsed. According to our own parameters, the most important question is whether the imagery of Matthew 24 draws upon that found in the apocalypses and may, therefore, be described as "apocalyptic."[194] A full discussion of the imagery and what it refers to will be provided below, but at this point, the key fact that should be noted is the allusion to the revelatory parts of the book of Daniel in 24:15 and 30, both crucial verses to this whole section. Few would call into question the apocalyptic character[195] of the book of Daniel; if it does indeed lie in the background of these passages then we have no difficulty in referring to Matthew 24:15 and 30 as apocalyptic. These verses are inseparable from their context, which draws on material less easily described as "apocalyptic" from various streams of Jewish tradition.[196] It may be argued that the surrounding verses are made apocalyptic by 24:15 and 30, so that they are essentially guilty-by-association, but it is probably better to regard the discourse as a whole as "prophetic," with

---

[192] See the discussion of this in G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, (London: Macmillan, 1954), 1–80. Probably the best example of this approach within Matthean scholarship is A.H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, (New York: St Martin's Press, 1915); see especially 343–44.

[193] See Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 44–47.

[194] For a number of reasons, including the absence of explicit revelatory features, Rowland prefers not to regard Mark 13 and its parallels as apocalyptic. See *The Open Heaven*, pp. 43–47. To some extent, I am in agreement with Rowland, particularly in his reticence to apply the term to these verses simply on the basis of the eschatology found within them. His caution is an important corrective to those who describe this material as apocalyptic and then immediately assume that it speaks of a literal end-of-the-world scenario. Nevertheless, as will be suggested below, some of the material seems to explicitly draw on apocalyptic material and is, therefore, at least in a derivative sense, "apocalyptic."

[195] At least, few would challenge this generic classification. It has, of course, been suggested that Daniel is not apocalyptic in the sense that it does not reflect the worldview of the "apocalyptic" movement. See Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*, (trans. W.J. Short; JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 26. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 83–4.

[196] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:326–70, provide thorough descriptions of possible "parallels" and "background."

the occurrences of apocalyptic imagery in 24:15 and 30 playing a central role. In either case, Jesus is clearly portrayed as one who prophetically reveals God's plan.

Acknowledging the apocalyptic or prophetic character of these verses, however, raises another problem: what precisely do they refer to? The answers to this question are diverse: on one hand, Dale C. Allison[197] claims to be reclaiming the heritage of Schweitzer by seeing Jesus as a prophet of the imminent end and understanding these words in a fairly literal sense as depicting the end of the present cosmos. On the other hand, G.B. Caird[198] and N.T. Wright[199] have argued that these verses refer exclusively to the destruction of Jerusalem, centred on the fall of the temple, and do so using language that should be understood as metaphorical. In between these two positions are a multitude of opinions. For the purpose of my argument, I wish to categorise these views according to how they understand the fall of the temple, or the destruction of Jerusalem, to be referred to in these verses.

The Referent(s) of Matthew 24:4–44

The various understandings of Matthew 24, and specifically 24:4–44, may be broadly cat egorised into four main groups:

1. Matthew 24:4–44 refers exclusively to the fall of the temple in a non-eschatological sense, that is, it does not speak of the end of the present cosmos.
2. Matthew 24:4–44 refers exclusively to the *eschaton* and does not refer to the temple at all.
3. Matthew 24:4–44 refers to the fall of the temple as part of an eschatological scenario, the details of which are impossible to separate from one another.
4. Matthew 24:4–44 refers, in part, to the fall of the temple, but this event is deliberately separated in Matthew's redaction from future/final elements of the eschatological scenario.

---

[197] See, in particular, his essay responding to N.T. Wright's position: "Jesus and the Victory of Apocalyptic," in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's* Jesus and the Victory of God, (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1999), 126–141.

[198] See especially *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, (London: Duckworth, 1980), *in toto*, and *New Testament Theology*, completed and edited by L.D. Hurst (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 250–67.

[199] See *The New Testament and the People of God*, 280–338.

The first of these approaches is currently associated with N.T. Wright, who has argued that the destruction of Jerusalem and the fall of the temple are depicted throughout chapter 24. The Danielic language of verse 31, and the imagery of the surrounding verses, are understood as being metaphorical descriptions of Jesus' vindication as these events happen and the language of being "taken" in verses 39–41 is understood by him as being a reference to "secret police coming in the night, or of enemies sweeping through a village or city and seizing all they can."[200] This interpretation of 24:4–44 has consequences for Wright's interpretations of the *meshalim* of 24:44–25:46, which he sees as also describing these events.[201] The usual criticism of Wright is that he wrongly argues for the "apocalyptic language" of the passage as being figurative and metaphorical, rather than literal. This point shall be discussed below, where Wright's treatment of the Danielic source material—which is essentially the same as that of G.B. Caird—will be critiqued more fully in the context of a discussion of Matthew 24:30–31. One may criticise Wright on wider narratival grounds, however, as does Wilson,[202] who draws on David Garland's narrative study of the *meshalim* in Matthew 24–25 and isolates five problems with Wright's approach, at least as far as the Matthean text is concerned:

1. There is a recurrent theme of "reward" in several of the parables, which is not easily accounted for on Wright's interpretation.
2. The parable of the sheep and goats clearly has a future referent and there is no obvious point of transition into such a future sphere of concern other than 24:36.[203]
3. Wright interprets the word "taken" in a sinister way, but this is not the only way in which the verb can be understood. France, for example, argues for a more positive sense of "take someone to be with you."[204]

---

[200] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 366.

[201] See *The New Testament and the People of God*, 280–338. It should be noted that Wright does not disavow *any* notion of a second coming or of a climactic renewal of creation (see "In Grateful Dialogue: A Response," in Newman, ed., *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel*, 268–70, where he speaks of "lively" expectations for the future); simply that this text is not concerned with such an event.

[202] *When Will These Things Happen*, 228–9.

[203] This point will be examined further below, as we look at the views of Wilson and France.

[204] *Matthew*, 220.

4. There is a clear contrast between Jesus' exhortation to "read the signs" (24:32) and the emphasis throughout the *meshalim* that there will be no sign. Garland suggests that certain of the *meshalim* answer the question "what will be the sign of your coming?" in 24:3 with "there will be no sign."[205]
5. The term *parousia* is used in the disciples' question and in the section from 24:36 onward but not elsewhere in the account (except its "parenthetical" use in 24:27).[206]

These criticisms highlight significant problems in Wright's understanding of Matthew 24–25 and demonstrate that an interpretation of these chapters that excludes an end-time scenario is difficult to sustain throughout.

An example of the second approach, in which the discourse is regarded as exclusively eschatological, is Fred Burnett's study of Matthew 24.[207] The key to Burnett's approach lies in Matthew's redaction of the disciples' question in 24:3. In Mark 13:4 and Luke 21:7, the core question "when will these things happen?" is followed by another "and what will be the sign that they are all about to be fulfilled?"[208] In Matthew 24:3 this is altered to "and what will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?" Burnett's interpretation of 23:38 and 24:1 is that these verses reflect the rejection and withdrawal of Wisdom from Israel; understood against this background, he sees Jesus' prediction of the fall of the temple in 24:2 as simply the physical outworking of that withdrawal. On the basis of this, he argues that Matthew's redaction of the disciples' question creates a *caesura* between 24:2 and 24:4, a position that he supports by arguing that the καὶ in 24:3 is "epexegetical," meaning that the verse should be read as "Tell us, when will this happen, that is (καὶ), what will be the sign of your Parousia and the consummation of the Age?"[209] Understood in this way, the question, according to Burnett,

---

[205] *Reading Matthew*, 240.

[206] See France, *Matthew*, 342 & 347. The relevance of this point will be explored below.

[207] Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia*, esp. 183–224. Others who have taken this approach include Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, (HKNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1988) 2: 309–333; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), 331–41; Jack D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (London: SPCK, 1975) 29–30.

[208] In Luke, this is "… and what will be the sign that they are about to take place?" (τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι).

[209] Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia*, 207.

is now purely eschatological and no longer refers in any sense to the fall of the temple.

Burnett's argument is problematic for several reasons. First, his understanding that Jesus' departure from the temple represents the rejection and withdrawal of Wisdom is difficult to sustain: one must ask whether the idea of Wisdom's *rejection* was as well attested as he believes, given that he sees the *locus classicus* for the idea as being *1 Enoch* 42:1–3.[210] Second, if the καὶ is indeed epexegetical, then the fall of the temple is still the basic point of reference for the question. Third, his approach forces him into an anachronistic interpretation of 24:15 as referring to the desecration of Christian sanctuaries. Burnett's position, then, seems to be an impossible one to sustain, and while the first criticism is levelled uniquely at his argument, the second and third criticisms highlight problems with all approaches within this category.

In the third category of approaches to Matthew 24:4–44, in which the discourse is understood as depicting an eschatological scenario that includes the fall of the temple, may be grouped the views of the greatest number of contemporary scholars, despite a great deal of diversity in the details of their interpretations. Meier, for example, sees a single prophecy with two fulfilments,[211] while Davies and Allison understand the verses as depicting "the entire post-Easter period, interpreted in terms of the messianic woes."[212] Sim shares this understanding of Matthew 24, seeing the references to the fall of Jerusalem as serving the purposes of a historical review, lending credibility to the eschatological details that will follow.[213] These approaches are in one sense rather diverse, but at the same time they all regard the fall of the temple as belonging to a prophecy that concerns an eschatological scenario, within which it plays a key role, whether as a type of the last judgement or as an antecedent to it. Ultimately, the question of whether these approaches should be favoured above those that belong to category (4), below, is not an easy one to settle, a fact to which the current state of the debate testifies, and will hinge largely upon our understanding of the redaction of the disciples' question in 24:3 and of the referents of 24:29–31.

The fourth approach is associated with R.T. France and Alistair Wilson.[214] France, breaks the chapter down as follows:

---

[210] Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus Sophia*, 94–8.
[211] J.P. Meier, *Matthew*, (NT Message 3; Wilmington: Glazier, 1980), 283.
[212] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:331. For the messianic woes, see pages 331–333.
[213] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 160–169.
[214] Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen*, esp. 109–74.

(i) Jesus foretells the destruction of the temple (24:1–2)
(ii) Warnings against premature expectation (24:3–14)
(iii) The coming crisis in Judea (24:15–28)
(iv) Climax of the crisis within "this generation" (24:29–35)
(v) The unexpected *Parousia* of the Son of Man (24:36–25:13)
(vi) The Parable of the Talents (25:14–30)
(vii) The Last Judgement (25:31–46)[215]

Within this proposed structure, France sees verses 4–14 as specifying the kind of events which will be regarded by many as signifying the end but which the disciples are not to understand in this way. These verses thus serve as "a warning against premature expectation."[216] He then sees verses 15–28 as relating specifically to the fall of Jerusalem and its temple, with a deliberate transition in verse 36 into a discussion of the end of the age, a transition that effectively separates the two events from one another. The reference to the Son of Man "coming on the clouds" in 24:30–31 is understood as a metaphorical presentation of Jesus' vindication at the fall of Jerusalem, drawing on the imagery of Daniel 7:13,[217] and the reference to the visibility of the coming of the Son of Man in 24:27 is understood as a parenthetical reference to the *parousia*, intended to contrast the secret announcements of false messiahs with the true appearance of the Son of Man.[218] Thus, France's approach sees two events, and only two events, as being referred to in Matthew 24:4–44: the fall of Jerusalem (particularly the temple) and the *parousia* of the Son of Man. No events are described in the interim between these two events except, possibly, those that are specified as *not* belonging to the *parousia*.

France's interpretation of these verses and his understanding of their structure is attractive for two main reasons:

1. The interpretation provides a good explanation of Matthew's redaction of the disciples' question in 24:3. According to France, and those who follow this interpretation, this alteration effectively turns a

[215] The headings are taken from France, *Matthew*, 336–58.
[216] Ibid., 337.
[217] Ibid., 344. France comments, "the word *parousia* is *not* used here." (Emphasis original)
[218] See France, *Matthew*, 342 and, especially 347, where he writes that the word *parousia* "has been conspicuously absent from vv. 4–35 (except to state in v. 27 that the parousia is to be distinguished from the period then under discussion)."

two-part question about one event into a question about two events: the fall of the temple and the coming of Jesus at the end of the age.[219] Given that such an alteration has been made at the outset of this discourse, it is reasonable to expect that it would be reflected in the discourse itself, in Matthew's redactional re-arrangement of his source material.

2. Formally, the approach acknowledges the shift from predominantly 2nd person forms in 24:4–35 to more detached language in 24:36–40. Wilson comments, "While it could be argued that this is Matthew's editorial work serving to apply the passage specifically to the readers within his community, the more natural reading, on the assumption that Matthew is a faithful recorder of traditional material, is that it is the disciples who will witness and experience the events described."[220]

These specific points seem to be largely unaddressed by the approaches grouped together under category (3) above. However, those who have followed this approach have tended to base their interpretation of Matthew 24:30–31 upon a particular understanding of Daniel 7, one substantially similar to that of G.B. Caird and N.T. Wright—whom I have grouped, of course, in category (1)—and this understanding may be seriously flawed. It is important, therefore, to make some kind of assessment of these verses and of their interpretation by the scholars mentioned above. Since verse 30 is linked to verse 29 by the temporal phrase καὶ τότε, some examination of that verse must begin our study.

The Son of Man Coming on the Clouds

Matthew 24:29 employs cosmic imagery that seems to fuse Isaiah 13:10 and 34:4 in a "free conflation."[221]

> The sun will be darkened and the moon will not give its light,
> The stars will fall from the sky and the heavenly bodies will be shaken.

Davies and Allison read this as a description of the darkness of the *Endzeit*, suggesting that such darkness may reflect the common idea that the end-time reprises *Urzeit*.

---

[219] See France, *Matthew*, 337.
[220] Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen*, 139. Cf. Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 235.
[221] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:357.

> Perhaps the falling of the stars and the resultant darkness develop the *Urzeit/Endzeit* correlation in more than one way. Jewish legend spoke of a falling of stars near the beginning of the world: the fall of Satan and his host was often depicted as a crash of stars from the sky: 1 En 86.1–3; 88.1–3; Rev 12.4; Apoc. Elijah 4.11; cf Isa 14.12.[222]

Such an understanding of Matthew 24:29 is rejected by Wright,[223] France[224] and Wilson,[225] who note that in neither Isaiah 13:10 nor 34:4 is there any suggestion that what is being spoken of is the end of the world or eschatological judgement. It is quite clear in each text that what is being spoken of is an event of temporal destruction brought about by God's judgement: in the case of 13:10, this is the destruction of Babylon; in the case of 34:4 it is that of Edom and other surrounding nations. This is not to say that such language could not be drawn upon in dramatic ways within the apocalyptic tradition, but these scholars may be correct in urging that we pause and consider whether the cosmic language in Matthew is also being used to denote temporal destruction. Given that Jesus' speech has been occasioned by a question regarding Jerusalem's destruction, and given that most of the descriptions that precede verse 29 would be quite readily explained as describing such an event, the Isaianic meaning may be more plausible than that of *1 Enoch* 86 or 88, which are part of a work that is concerned with cosmology and calendrical issues and that employs a complex and nuanced interplay of stars and angels within its symbolic framework.[226] This would suggest that it is at least plausible to regard Matthew 24:29 as a metaphorical depiction of the fall of Jerusalem, presenting it as an act of divine judgement, using language previously used of Israel's enemies.

It is in verses 30 and 31, however, that problems arise in the approach taken by Caird *et al.* 24:30 opens with a reference to the sign of the Son of Man:

> At that time the sign of the Son of Man (τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) will appear in the sky, and all the nations of the earth will mourn. They will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of the sky, with power and great glory.

---

[222] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:358.
[223] *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 513.
[224] *Matthew*, 343–44.
[225] *When Will These Things Happen*, 154–56.
[226] For this fact, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 288: "In *1 Enoch* 86:1–3 stars are an image for the watchers, and in Daniel 12:3 and *1 Enoch* 104:2, stars and angels may even be identified with one another."

The reference to the "sign" of the Son of Man has various possible interpretations. It is possible that the genitive is one of apposition, in which case the sign *is* the Son of Man, or his coming.[227] A second possibility, popular among the church fathers, is that the sign was the cross.[228] A third possibility is that the term is equivalent to the Hebrew term נס, which means "banner" or "ensign." Glasson sees the imagery as pointing towards the raising of a standard as a rallying point for an eschatological battle.[229] Davies and Allison provide arguments in support of this last interpretation, including, importantly, the fact that the LXX often translates נס as σημεῖον. They themselves favour a combination of this understanding with the idea that the sign was the cross.[230]

The mention of the sign of the Son of Man leads in to the description of his coming upon the clouds of heaven (ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), which is the focal point of the interpretation taken by Caird, Wright, France and Wilson. The background to this description lies in Daniel 7:13, in which one like a son of man approaches the throne of the Ancient of Days "with the clouds of heaven."[231] As Caird notes, the direction of this coming in Daniel is heavenward, rather than earthward,[232] and there is nothing to suggest that this direction is different from that seen in Matthew 24:30 and its parallels. More importantly, regarding this Danielic background, Caird claims that "the entire scene is symbolic."[233] What, however, might be denoted in that symbolism? Caird and Wright favour the idea that the "one like a son of man" represents Israel as a nation (note the collective "saints of the Most High" in 7:18,22,27), just as the beasts described in Dan 7:2–7 represent successive empires.[234] According to Wright,[235] the significance of Israel being depicted as resembling a human surely lies in the stark contrast

---

[227] So W.C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), 258–9; Lindars, *Son of Man*, 128–9; Meier, *Matthew*, 287.

[228] This view is seen in, for example, Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 15:22; Chrysostom, *Homily on Matthew*, 76:3.

[229] Glasson, T.F. "The Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt 24.30)" *JTS* 15 (1964), 299–300.

[230] *Matthew* 3: 359–60.

[231] The strong correspondence with Daniel 7:13 means that, whatever the rights and wrongs of the idea that *bar nasha* in the gospel/historical Jesus traditions is simply a circumlocution, we are clearly dealing at this point in our text with an allusion to a specific text. A full discussion of the coming Son of Man sayings in Matthew can be found in Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen*, 161–72.

[232] Caird, *New Testament Theology*, 377.

[233] Caird, *New Testament Theology*, 377.

[234] See Wright, *New Testament and the People of God*, 291–92.

[235] *New Testament and the People of God*, 292–295.

with the bestial, inhuman nature of the other nations, as they are represented. This undergirds his suggestion that the imagery denotes some idea of Israel being a "true humanity" in the midst of a populace that has lost its humanity by turning from God.[236] Israel shall be seen to have been correct to trust in and follow God. The one like a son of man, and his coming with the clouds, is a symbol of vindication in the face of the arrogance of God's enemies, whose boasting (Dan 7:8,11–2,23–25) is silenced by the exaltation of the saints.

Coming to Matthew 24:30 with this background in mind, it would be reasonable to expect that the explicit allusion to Daniel also carries such symbolic value. Wright, Caird, France, and now Wilson all take it this way, believing that when properly contextualised, the most obvious "vindicating" event would be the fall of the temple, which vindicates Jesus and his disciples as being the true people of God over and against those who have illegitimately taken over sovereignty of God's kingdom, those challenged and polemicised throughout chapters 21–23. If this point is granted, it becomes possible to read the language of 24:31 as reflecting this use of metaphor. As has been mentioned already, the image of the "ensign" or "banner" is one that conveys the idea of rallying. Such imagery is natural in the context of triumph, but may also connect with wider themes within the gospel of the gathering of a remnant from throughout the world. Such an idea has been encountered already in 12:38–42 and will close the book dramatically in 28:19. Garland suggests that the image of angels gathering the elect from the four winds seems most naturally to symbolise, in language at home in apocalyptic writings, the global vision of this gospel.[237]

Given that the original sense of Daniel 7 is so important to the interpretation of Matthew 24:30 advocated by Caird and those who have followed him, some assessment of their treatment of this passage is in order. Of particular importance in this regard is the work of John Collins on the Daniel text.[238] Collins provides a thorough and insightful study of Daniel 7 with an extended discussion of the identity of the Son of

---

[236] "The symbol is obviously pregnant with the meaning of Genesis 2, evoking the idea of the people of God as the true humanity and the pagan nations as the animals." *New Testament and the People of God*, 292.

[237] See Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 239.

[238] See his commentary, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, with an Essay, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," by Adela Yarbro Collins.* Hermeneia. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 274–324. Wright rejects the kind of interpretation taken by Collins, but his rejection is based on a broad conceptual discussion of kinds of "representation" rather than on a detailed analysis of the literary structure of Daniel 7, such as that provided by Collins.

Man figure and of the "holy ones of the Most High."[239] As a matter of historical fact, he notes that the corporate understanding of the Son of Man as a symbol of Israel does not appear in Jewish exegesis of the text until the medieval period[240] and first appears in Christian exegesis in the 4th century writings of Ephrem Syrus,[241] a point that raises serious problems for the argument that Jesus and his contemporaries (or the author of Matthew's Gospel, for that matter) would have naturally understood the Son of Man imagery as symbolic of national vindication. Moreover, his close examination of the unfolding scenario of Daniel 7 demonstrates that while the beasts that rise from the sea are clearly allegorical representations of pagan kingdoms, the one like a Son of Man cannot be categorised in like manner: no allegorical/symbolic significance is assigned to him within the text, unlike the beasts from the sea (Daniel 7:17), and his appearance is coordinated with the description of God as the Ancient of Days, which is not symbolic but rather, to use Collins's categorisation "mythic-realistic." This phrase indicates that an actual, real heavenly figure is being described in language drawn from the religio-historical background. Thus, the one like a Son of Man is best understood as a real heavenly figure, distinct from God,[242] and not a representation of Israel.

In addition, Collins provides strong arguments that the references to the "Holy Ones of the Most High" should be understood as being to angels, and not to Israel. He notes the use of the term "holy ones" in a broad range of Jewish texts, almost always indicating angelic figures,[243] and his argument is clinched by the fact that in Daniel 4:10, 14, 20 and 8:13 the term "holy one(s)" is used in connection with heavenly beings.[244] The objection that this would make the vision irrelevant to the disenfranchised Jews to whom it speaks[245] is dismissed by Collins, who notes the angelic warfare portrayed in Daniel 10–12 and concludes, "To the pious Jews of the Maccabean era, who had a lively belief in

---

[239] See his excurses, "One Like a Human Being," on pages 304–10; and "Holy Ones," on pages 313–17. Also note the comments that follow the latter excursus on 317–18.

[240] *Daniel*, 307.

[241] Ibid., 308.

[242] Collins suggests that Michael may be in view, and presents good arguments in favour of this, but acknowledges that precise identification is impossible.

[243] *Daniel*, 313–17.

[244] Ibid., 318.

[245] See L.F. Hartman and A.A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel*, (AB 23; New York: Doubleday, 1978), 91.

supernatural beings, nothing could be more relevant than that their angelic patrons should "receive the kingdom."[246]

Returning to Matthew 24:30–31, the view that the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven should be understood as symbolic of the vindication of God's people—on the basis that it would have been understood in this way by those familiar with its original sense in Daniel 7:13—must be rejected as without foundation. Instead, if the original sense of Daniel 7 does inform this passage—and we must be prepared for the fact that either Matthew or the traditions he handled may have departed to some extent from that original sense—then the language would be more likely to be understood by first century readers as referring to the enthronement of a heavenly figure. It is here that the most obvious and significant departure from the Danielic source material has been made by the gospel writers and by nascent Christianity, for this heavenly figure has now been explicitly identified with Jesus. That this is the case is made clear by the three-way link between this description of the Son of Man coming with the clouds, the later description of the *parousia* of the Son of Man (24:36–41) and the second half of the disciples' question in 24:3: "What will be the sign of your *parousia* and of the end of the age?"

It is more plausible, then, to see Matthew 24:30 as referring to the heavenly enthronement of Jesus, an understanding that dovetails nicely with the commissioning of the angels to gather the elect in verse 31 (similar imagery occurs in Matthew 13:39–41, where it is undoubtedly connected to eschatological judgement): the angelic host here seems reminiscent of the description of the holy ones in Daniel 7. This understanding is also consistent with the understanding of the Son of Man as being enthroned on God's throne that is seen in the Parables of Enoch, which, as we have seen, were very likely to have been influential on Matthew's thought. This point will be taken up below, in the context of a discussion of the *meshalim* in Matthew 25.

The question of when this enthronement takes place remains difficult to answer. If, as Davies and Allison suggest, the "sign of the Son of Man" is the cross, functioning as the eschatological banner,[247] then perhaps it is seen as taking place at the death of Jesus. It would be difficult on such an interpretation, however, to understand the significance of the temporal language of verse 29 (Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν τῶν

[246] Collins, *Daniel*, 318.
[247] *Matthew* 3:359–60.

ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων: "Immediately after the distress of those days…") and of verse 30 (καὶ τοτε: "and then…"). If even some of the imagery preceding these temporal references depicts the fall of Jerusalem, then they would seem to locate the enthronement as occurring *after* that event. It seems more likely, then, that verse 30 does not indicate an expectation that the enthronement will take place at a specific point in time, but rather reflects a simple expectation of the future enthronement of Jesus, a prerequisite of the judgement that he will subsequently enact at his *parousia*.

To return to the four categories of approach to Matthew 24, the first and second approaches have been rejected as untenable. The fourth approach is attractive for many reasons, but its central claim that Matthew 24:30–31 would be understood by anyone familiar with Daniel 7 as being a symbolic description of the fall of Jerusalem cannot be sustained in the light of Collins's study (a criticism that also further undermines the first approach). Nevertheless, the observation that there is a preponderance of 2nd person forms in the verses prior to 24:36 and the attempt to explain Matthew's redaction of the disciples' question in 24:3 remain helpful. I would suggest that rather than function to separate imminent events from more remote ones, as France and Wilson suggest, these elements of Matthew's arrangement draw attention to the fact that the events that will be witnessed by the disciples—particularly those surrounding the destruction of Jerusalem and the fall of the temple—are part of an eschatological scenario. Thus, the redaction draws attention to the fact that inaugural events within the eschatological scenario have been *witnessed*, a fact that reinforces the sense that the present time is eschatological. This point continues to be valid if (as seems necessary) the fourth approach is rejected in favour of the third, in which Matthew 24:4–44 refers to the fall of the temple as part of an eschatological scenario, the details of which are impossible to separate from one another. In either case, the words of France could be validly cited:

> The fact that the destruction of the temple and the "close of the age" can be dealt with together in the same chapter indicates that there is a close *theological connection* between them.[248]

[248] *Matthew*, 334.

The Coordination of the Fall of the Temple and the Last Judgement

The study thus far has focused on verses 1–35 of Matthew 24, which have been understood as moving from a question regarding the fall of the temple to a description of the return of the exalted Jesus and thus as reinforcing the sense that the present time is eschatological. The following verses, from 24:36 on, are understood by R.T. France as answering the second half of the disciples' question, concerning "the end of the age," and only Wright, whose argument has been rejected above, would significantly challenge this understanding of what these verses refer to.

This material then gives way to a series of *meshalim* concerned with the final judgement. I want to propose, in what follows, that Matthew's arrangement of material in these *meshalim*, coordinates the destruction of the temple with the final judgement. Specifically, it draws attention to the connections that exist between the criteria that are used in the judgement on the temple (or on Israel) and in the final judgement.

The Meshalim: *Prophecy and Paraenesis*

Before studying the detail of the *meshalim* found in 24:45–25:46, it is of interest to note that their use at this point in the text continues to reinforce the idea that Jesus is a figure of wisdom. As noted in the discussion of *meshalim* in Chapter 1, Matthew presents the form as sapiential. The presence at this point in the narrative of a series of *meshalim*, brought together stylistically, reinforces strongly the idea that Jesus is a sage. The fact that they are being used to teach eschatological truths, with ideas more strongly associated with the genre apocalypse, indicates that Matthew's conception of Jesus is that of a sage rather more in the mould of Enoch or Daniel than of Ben Sira: he is a revealer of eschatological truths. Nowhere is this more strongly seen than in 25:31–46, in which the depiction of judgement is presented using figurative imagery that may well draw upon the Son of Man imagery in the Parables of Enoch. The presentation of Jesus' wisdom here, therefore, is reminiscent of that seen in the *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*, each of which in its own way attested to such a fusion of sapiential and apocalyptic traditions. (As an aside, this strong Jewish background ought to give scholars cause for caution in pronouncing these *meshalim* a late innovation, at least on the basis of the fact that they reflect such a fusion. Pure sapiential and pure apocalyptic texts are not well attested in the New Testament period.) More relevant to the present study is the fact that it is one more piece of evidence that Matthew is concerned to present Jesus as a figure of great

wisdom and will do so in his arrangement of material, some of which is not found in the other gospels.[249]

As far as the content of the *meshalim* is concerned, Garland identifies several narrative themes:

> (a) The sudden arrival of something or someone that creates a crisis appears in all five parables (24:37,39,43,44,46; 25:6,19). (b) A key figure is delayed in three of the parables (24:48; 25:5,19) (c) The exhortation to watch (24:42,43; 25:13) and be ready (24:44; 25:10) for the unknown time of arrival (24:37,42–44,50; 25:10) sets the tone for the first four parables. (d) The division of the characters into two separate categories (the wise, the faithful and good versus the wicked, foolish and hesitant, 24:45,48; 25:2,21,23,26) appears in the last four parables. (e) The last three parables also contain a judgement scene in which the faithful and ready receive a joyous reward (24:46; 25:10–11,21,23), and the unfaithful and unready are banished and/or ruthlessly punished (24:39,51; 25:10,30).[250]

The fact that the parables are concerned with the last judgement at the time of Jesus' return is hard to avoid when these themes are appreciated and when they are related back to the disciples' question in 24:3. The basic paraenetic function is obvious: be ready for that return by being careful to honour the Lord. This idea of honouring the Lord, or the "master," is developed in several ways. In the first *mashal* (24:45–51), the servant is specifically required to care for his fellow servants (24:45); in the second (25:1–13), the virgins are expected to take part in the wedding banquet festivities, something they can only do properly with lamps properly fuelled; in the third (25:14–30), the servants are entrusted with their master's property and expected to want to "grow" that property[251] and thus expand his estate; in the final *mashal* (25:31–46),[252] the basis for the separation of the two groups is not, fundamentally, their commitment to humanitarianism but rather their attitude to Jesus as it is expressed in that humanitarian concern.[253] They are thus judged on whether they have honoured Jesus as king.

---

[249] For the question of the relationship of this material to the other gospels and to the hypothetical sources, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:385–6, 391–4, 402–4, 417–8. Actually, only 25:31–46 is generally seen as a thoroughly Matthean composition.

[250] *Reading Matthew*, 239.

[251] On the use of agricultural imagery in this *mashal*, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 409, and Gundry, *Matthew*, 507–8, who comments that there is a "desire to portray the master's activity in terms that symbolize gathering his disciples into a true synagogue."

[252] I shall use the term *mashal* with regard to this section of the text despite some concerns over whether the terminology is appropriate. I am inclined to regard the extended metaphor of sheep and goats as warranting the categorisation.

[253] So Garland, "Reading Matthew," 244–245.

This paraenetic function has obvious relevance for Christians, such as those for whom, at least in part, Matthew wrote. On this level, there are some interesting connections to be noted with wider ethical and theological themes in the gospel. The care for fellow servants in the first *mashal* connects with the emphasis on brotherly love in 5:21–26; the imagery of the virgins' lamps may draw on that found in 5:14–16; the agricultural imagery in the parable of the talents may reflect the use of such language in connection with the kingdom in 12:30 and, especially, in 13:1–23;[254] finally the humanitarian aspects of fidelity to the king in the final *mashal* seem to reflect ideas found throughout the gospel relating to Jesus' compassion on and concern for the needy (e.g. 6:1–4, 15:14, 32), but the parable also relates back to the missionary discourse of chapter 10 and also to 18:1, both of which contain the idea of receiving Jesus by receiving his representatives. There are, therefore, numerous ways in which the *meshalim* relate to Matthew's presentation of the responsibilities of those who are Jesus' followers.

Yet, there are also ways in which these *meshalim* can be seen as relating to the judgement on Israel represented by the fall of the temple, as described in chapter 24 and as announced by the woes of chapter 23. The reference to the wicked servant's cruel treatment of his fellows (24:48–9) is easily connected with the introduction to the series of woes in chapter 23 (23:2–7). This section makes clear, in a kind of thesis statement for all that will follow, that these were pronounced upon the Jewish leaders for their oppression of fellow Jews (23:4).The proposal that the servants' behaviour should be connected with that of the Jewish leaders receives support from the fact that the judgement on the cruel servant is to be assigned a place "with the hypocrites" (24:51), a term used in the introduction to all but one of the woes pronounced on the Jewish leaders (23:13,15,23,25,27,29; cf. also 23:28). The point seems to be that the behaviour of the wicked servant is a hypocrisy, parallel to that of the Jewish leaders who received judgement as the temple fell.

A strong link with the woes may also be seen with the parable of the talents. By means of repetition, the parable draws attention to the expectation of the master that he will reap where he has not sown and will gather where he has not scattered.[255] This imagery is agricultural, a fact that in itself is striking in an otherwise financial parable.[256]

---

[254] More shall be said on this below.
[255] 25:24–7.
[256] See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:409; Gundry, *Matthew*, 507–8.

It becomes all the more striking when we consider the fact that such language is used in an extended sense in the parables of chapter 13. The most obvious connection is with 13:23, in which the image of the great harvest is to be found. Similar language is also used by Jesus in 12:30. The link between all of these images is the idea that the master has an expectation that his estate will grow and is, in the parable of the talents at least, displeased with those who hoard it unproductively.[257] This is the very accusation levelled at the Jewish leaders in 23:13:

> You shut the kingdom of heaven in men's faces.

Indeed, there is a shocking twist given to this verse in the subsequent woe:

> You travel across land and sea to win a single proselyte, and when he becomes one, you make him twice as much a son of Gehenna as you are. (23:15)

Not only does this verse stress the anti-Kingdom nature of the Jewish leaders' proselytising (in describing converts as sons of Gehenna), but it also stresses the paucity of this work: it is a single (ἕνα) convert that is made.

Finally, the *mashal* of the sheep and goats speaks of a universal judgement on all humanity (25:32) and while the criterion of judgement is ultimately their attitude to the King,[258] that attitude is exposed by the extent to which they have shown humanitarian concern for "the least of these brothers of mine" (25:40,45). Again, a link may be seen with the woes pronounced upon the Jewish leaders. In 23:23–4, they are condemned for neglecting "the more important matters of the law: justice, mercy and faithfulness." The condemnation pronounced upon the nations of the world is, therefore, linked to that pronounced upon the Jewish leaders.

As mentioned above, N.T. Wright has argued that the true referent of the parable of the talents is Jesus' coming to Jerusalem and the pronouncement of judgement upon the Jewish leadership.[259] Elements of his argument are interesting and helpful, not least his recognition that

---

[257] Note also the description of this servant as "worthless" or "unprofitable" (ἀχρεῖος). See also Lane C. McGaughy, "Fear of Yahweh and the Mission of Judaism: a Postexilic Maxim and its Early Christian Expansion in the Parable of the Talents." *JBL* 94 (1975), 235–245.

[258] As noted above, see Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 243–5.

[259] *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 632–40.

the servants in the parable are in a position of trust, which one servant fails to live up to and from which he is then ejected.[260] An essential part of Wright's argument, however, is that the natural connection to be made by the reader is with the coming of Jesus into Jerusalem, an event which, in the parallel account of Luke 19:28–44, immediately follows the parable. In Matthew's account, however, the parable has been shifted into a context that follows Jesus "departure" from the temple (24:1). This fact, combined with the fact that it is juxtaposed with the parable of the sheep and goats, clearly descriptive of the last Judgement, means that in its Matthean context the most obvious association of the "coming" of the master[261] is not with Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem, but with the final judgement. The connections Wright has made with the judgement of the Jewish leaders remain valid, however, and taken together with the connections I have proposed above, with the woes of chapter 23, they point to a significant fact: the judgement of the Jewish leadership and the destruction of the temple, while separated temporally from the last judgement are nevertheless coordinated with it by Matthew. That is, he has drawn attention to the associations between the two events, to the level of continuity that exists between them.

This point requires to be set in the context of Matthew's wider narrative. As noted already, Jesus has been portrayed as the one revealing eschatological wisdom, including the proper manner of behaviour expected of those who are the people of God, the true righteousness. The narrative of Matthew has stressed, however, that this revelation of wisdom has been rejected by the Jewish leaders and, indeed, by all Israel, with the exception of those whose ears have been miraculously opened. The conflict between Jesus and the Jewish leadership that took place in the temple courts, the pronouncement of woes upon them and the symbolic departure of Jesus from the temple represent the culmination of that rejection. The prophesied destruction of the temple, then, is portrayed by Matthew as being the consequence of the rejection of Jesus' wisdom and thus a type of the final judgement, when all humanity—not just the Jewish leadership—will be held accountable for its reaction to that wisdom.

---

[260] Ibid., 638.

[261] 25:19 speaks of this coming as follows: μετὰ δὲ πολὺν χρόνον ἔρχεται ὁ κύριος τῶν δούλων ἐκείνων.

This point seems to be confirmed by the use of "wisdom" language in the first two *meshalim.* In the first (24:45–51) it is the "faithful and wise" servant (ὁ πιστὸς δσῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος) who is blessed (μακάριος) on his master's return and made ruler of all his goods.[262] In the second (25:1–12), the virgins are divided into two groups: the wise and the foolish (πέντε δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἦσαν μωραὶ καὶ πέντε φρόνιμοι) and, of course, it is the wise who are allowed to participate in the celebrations. When these stories are read in the light of Matthew 7:24–27, where it is the *practice* of Jesus' teaching that represents wisdom, then their true significance emerges: they are not simply about readiness and fidelity, but concern the fact that such fidelity is specifically to the wisdom of Jesus, in all its practical aspects. These *meshalim* depict a person's future, which, like that of the temple, will be determined by that person's response to Jesus' teaching. As Garland notes, this is true even in the case of the image of the sheep and the goats, where the importance of the humanitarian actions lies in the fact that they are performed in service of the King.[263]

By means of this coordination, Matthew has turned the fall of the temple into a type of the final judgement and has made it serve his concern to depict Jesus' teaching as crucial to salvation. Thus, the importance of Jesus as the revealer of wisdom has been reinforced and the importance of accepting and abiding by that wisdom emphasised.

Before concluding our study of these *meshalim* one final observation must be made. As was noted in chapter 2, Matthew's depiction of Jesus as Son of Man, seated on the "throne of his glory," in 25:31, is very likely to have been derived from the Parables of Enoch. The arguments presented in chapter 2 need not be rehearsed here. What is, I think, significant about this is that in developing the idea of Jesus as eschatological judge, Matthew has utilised a tradition that placed such a strong emphasis upon the fact that this judge is also the great revealer, the great figure of wisdom, and has done so using a sapiential form within which the knowledge of the Son of Man of all human deeds is central. The question of what this implies about the relationship of Jesus to God may be important, but equally important is the way in which it continues to bring to the fore Jesus status as revealer *par excellence.*

---

[262] Cf. Matthew 5:5?

[263] *Reading Matthew*, 243–5.

Part 2. Restored Creation and Ethics in Matthew's Gospel

It has now, I think, been adequately demonstrated that Matthew is marked by a similar eschatology to that observed in *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*, namely one in which the eschatological period is inaugurated by the revealing of wisdom to the elect. Under the influence of such an eschatology—and in line with the two texts previously studied—we would surely expect to see in Matthew an eschatologising of sapiential forms and a fusion of such forms with more prophetic ones. This indeed can be seen in the prophetic *meshalim* of 24:45–25:46, discussed above, and in the various forms used in the Sermon on the Mount. A close examination of this phenomenon in the case of the latter would be desirable, but would be an enormous task in itself. Instead, in what remains of this chapter I shall follow through one of the most intriguing questions to have been raised by our study of *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*: what role does the idea of "restored creation" play in the ethical system of Matthew's Gospel? Since, within the sections we have studied, the ethical teaching is most obviously found in the Sermon on the Mount, that shall be the focus of the remainder of the study.

1. *The Beatitudes (5: 5–12): Hoping for a Better World*

There is certainly some suggestion in the beatitudes that open the Sermon of a future in which the Earth will no longer be held under the sway of sinners.[264] The fact that the meek shall "inherit the earth" (5:5) is of note,[265] as is the emphasis on the righteousness (or "justice", depending

[264] Perry Kea, "The Sermon on the Mount: Ethics and Eschatological Time," 87–92, notes that the great problem addressed by Jesus' advent is the lack of righteousness in Israel. He highlights, from a narrative point of view, the surprising fact that the Sermon does not open with a call to righteous conduct, but rather with the beatitudes. In Kea's view, this has Christological importance, stressing the presence (or inbreaking) of the kingdom in Jesus Immanuel.

[265] It may be of relevance that the phrase "inherit the earth" occurs in 4Q475, a fragment that speaks of restored creation and a renewed earth. There is no clear reference to the "meek" in this fragment, however; the parallel is, therefore, incomplete. See Elgvin, "Renewed Earth and Restored Creation: 4Q475," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts and reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 577–91. See also Charette's discussion of the "earth" theme in the Beatitudes in *The Theme of Recompense*, 84–91. Charette sees the reference as being part of Matthew's eschatological scheme, in which the "land" promise of the Abrahamic covenant and Deuteronomic material comes to point towards the renewed earth in the eschaton.

on the translation of δικαιοσύνη)[266] after which some hunger and thirst (5:6).[267] The background of the beatitudes in Isaiah 61 and 66 may also be of some significance, given that the portrayal of the transformation of God's people in that part of the prophetic book climaxes in "new creation" imagery (Is. 65:17–25; 66:22).[268]

2. *The Antitheses (5:21–48): Recovering Eden*

More substantial evidence may be seen, however, in the antitheses (5:21–48), in which Jesus cites regulations from the Torah with the words "you have heard it said…" before providing his own, more intense moral position with the words "but I say unto you…" Some have seen this as simply reflecting the cut and thrust of rabbinic debate, so that the citation formula refers to the interpretation of Torah taken by Jesus' opponents (and not the Torah itself).[269] The problem with such a view is that what is actually cited is, with the exception of a single clause,[270] Torah. The inference of the antitheses seems to be that it is Torah itself that is inadequate and needs to be intensified, rather than the Pharisaic interpretation of it. This point may be reinforced by 5:20, which requires a righteousness that exceeds that of "the Pharisees and the teachers of the law," the two groups most widely identified as being exemplars of Torah-faithfulness.[271] This does not imply a rejection of Torah (as 5:17–19 make clear), but rather an acknowledgement of its inadequacy.[272]

---

[266] Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 93. It is worth noting that the presence of δικαιοσὺνη in this verse is generally held to be Matthean redaction. This creates a strong link between this future state and the present behaviour of the disciples in 5:20.

[267] There is an issue here, of course, as to whether the beatitudes should be seen as "eschatological blessings" or "entrance requirements." Guelich, "The Matthean Beatitudes: Entrance Requirements or Eschatological Blessings?," *JBL* 95 (1976), 432–33 and Davies and Allison 1:439–40, argue for the former, while Betz, *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*, 33, argues for the latter. The discussion will be taken up below.

[268] For this background, see Gundry, *Matthew*, 69–73; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1.436–9. See also Adrian M. Leske's arguments that the beatitudes and the salt and light sayings (5:13–16) draw heavily upon Isaiah 40–66 ("The Beatitudes, Salt and Light in Matthew and Luke," *SBLSP 1991*, 817–39.

[269] So Betz, *Sermon*, 200–14; also Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 111–2. Anthony Saldarini, in *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, 124–64, also takes this approach, but fails to deal with the issues that are outlined here. In fact, it is a striking omission from his work that he fails to interact with the *antitheses*-unit as a whole, particularly the importance of the contrast established between Jesus' words and those of Torah by the structural arrangement.

[270] "…and hate your enemy." (5:43). Even here, however, we might note the closeness of the sentiment to Psalm 139:21–2 before writing it off as unbiblical.

[271] We might paraphrase this verse: "unless your righteousness exceeds that of the best law-keepers, you will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven."

[272] Cf. Romans 8:3.

What is striking about the antitheses is that, with the exception of the final antithesis, no rationale is provided for the intensification of the requirements of Torah: Jesus simply heightens the moral requirements of the regulations and warns of the consequences of transgression. A rationale for each may, however, be found in the design plan of Creation. This is most easily demonstrated in the case of the two antitheses dealing with marital ethics (5:27–30 and 5:31–2). The reader of Matthew's Gospel as a whole will be struck by the fact that when Jesus returns to the subject of marital ethics in 19:3–12, his moral position is entirely based upon the Creation narrative (19:4–6) and is critical of the Mosaic provision for divorce (19:7–9), of which it is said, "It was not this way from the beginning." Thus, the Creation provides the true paradigm which the Torah reflects imperfectly. Returning to the Sermon on the Mount, the same reader would surely read these two antitheses as reflecting Jesus' understanding of the ethics inherent to the design of Creation. What, though, of the other antitheses?

The final antithesis, concerning love for enemies (5:43–48), is the only one to carry an explicit rationale: "that you may be sons of your father in heaven." The function of this clause is to root behaviour in the imitation[273] of God, "who causes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous." Essentially, the believer is being called to deliberately *resemble* God or, to put it another way, to be his *image.* The son/father imagery is highly suggestive here of the *imago dei* of Genesis 1:26, particularly where that image is understood as functional and not simply ontological.

Such a connection between the *imitatio dei* and the *imago dei* is well-established. The text of Gen 1:26 itself is open to an interpretation that sees the *imago dei* in functional terms, with mankind made to be God's "representative" on earth. Such an interpretation of the term צלם is discussed by Gordon Wenham[274] who, having discussed the various possibilities for understanding the term, concludes:

> The strongest case has been made for the view that the divine image makes man God's vice-regent on earth. Because man is God's representative, life is sacred: every assault on man is an affront to the creator and merits the ultimate penalty (Gen 9:5–6).[275]

---

[273] Note also the language of 5:48: Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τελειός ἐστιν; "You shall be perfect, therefore, even as your father in the heavens is perfect."

[274] Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, (WBC 1; Waco: Word, 1987), 30–31.

[275] Ibid., 32.

This last point, on the sanctity of human life, will have implications for another of the antitheses, but at this stage in the argument, the key point is that as God's representative on earth, man is surely expected to behave in a God-like way. Lest it be suggested that such an idea does not necessarily correspond with the understanding of Genesis 1:26 that Jesus and his contemporaries may have had, we may note Martin Buber's study of *imitatio dei* in Jewish religiosity,[276] which draws upon ancient and more contemporary Jewish writings and argues,

> "For in the image of God made He man." It is on this that the imitation of God is founded. We are destined to be like him, this means that we are destined to bring perfection out of ourselves, in actual life, the image in which we were created…[277]

While Buber's language does not correspond entirely with the argument being made in the context of this antithesis, it establishes the central point: the *imitatio dei* is intimately connected to *imago dei* and such a connection was made in ancient times as well as in modern. As this antithesis calls the reader to *imitatio dei*, surely the use of son/father imagery would be naturally connected with the *imago dei.*

Conceptually, this final antithesis seems closely linked to the previous one, which concerns non-retaliation (5:38–42): both passages are concerned with the treatment of those with whom some form of enmity exists. It seems legitimate to suggest that in two closely linked antitheses, a similar rationale may be operative; consequently, it seems legitimate to suggest that the *imago dei* rationale governs both of these pericopae and that the reader of Matthew's gospel would naturally associate the non-retaliatory treatment of those who have wronged him with the love of God/the sons of God for enemies.

Although not so immediately obvious, the *imago dei* may also provide the rationale for the first antithesis, concerning murder and contempt (5:21–22). Conceptually, the discussion is similar to material found in *2 Enoch* 44, where the sinfulness of treating another human with contempt lies in the fact that God has made man "in a facsimile of his own face."[278] We have noted above, in the discussion of Genesis 1:26, that

---

[276] Martin Buber, *Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis*, (2nd Edition, New York: Schocken Books, 1973), 66–77.

[277] Buber, *Israel and the World*, 73.

[278] *2 Enoch* 44:1. The translation is Francis Andersen's in "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1.171. We must be cautious in our use of *2 Enoch*, as it is an open question as to whether the text is Jewish or Christian; if it is the latter then the similarity between the two texts may be the result of the influence of Matthew 5:21–22 on the author(s) of

such a standpoint is the logical and contextual implication of man's status as the representative of God. That such a concern is at work here may be supported by the reference to worship in 5:23–24, to which we may compare James 3:9, in which the inconsistency of worshipping God with the same mouth that curses "men made in God's likeness" is the basis for James' standards of acceptable speech. Again, therefore, the ethical expectations of Jesus in these antitheses seem to stem from the very pattern of Creation itself, specifically the respect required towards all who bear (or function as) the image of God.[279]

This leaves unexplained only the antithesis concerning oath-taking (5:33–7). Davies and Allison note that the oaths under consideration in 5:33–37 may not be promissory vows, but rather oaths related to the truthfulness of one's speech.[280] This certainly seems consistent with the "yes, yes" and "no, no" reference. Kennedy has argued that the ὅτι clauses do not provide justification for Jesus" prohibition, but rather introduce the reasons for the oath-taker swearing by a particular thing.[281] Taking these together, it may be suggested that the point of this antithesis is not to prohibit the taking of vows, but rather to encourage a transparent truthfulness that needs recourse to no oaths.[282] Given that one of the great characteristics of God is his truthfulness (cf. Titus 1:2), it is at least possible that such honesty is required because it should be a characteristic of those who are God's image and representation on earth. The need to go beyond such transparent truthfulness is portrayed as being from "the evil one" (5:37). While no final case can be made for

---

the apocalypse. The point being made, however, is defensible on the internal evidence of Matthew and is supported by the comparison with James 3:9.

[279] On this point, note the recent work of Katell Berthelot, *"L'Humanité de L'Autre Homme" dans la Pensée Juive Ancienne* (JSJSupp 87; Leiden: Brill, 2004). Chapter 3 (166–239) of this book deals with the paradigm of creation. It is interesting that Berthelot finds the idea of a "humanist ethic," which sees inherent status in human beings made in God's image, to be a rather marginal theme in Second Temple Jewish literature, though one that is not absent. In fact, he discusses *2 Enoch* as one of his "exceptions that prove the rule," (183–89); this work, and its ethical concepts, will be discussed further in my next chapter.

[280] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:535–6.

[281] G. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 56. The point of course fits with the fact that otherwise in the antitheses, no argument is provided for patterns of behaviour until the "that you might be sons" statement.

[282] So Davies and Allison, *Matthew vol. i*, 536. Note that Bauckham's discussion of James 5:12, a text which clearly draws upon this, argues for the same kind of understanding. See his *James: Wisdom of James, the Disciple of Jesus the Sage*, (London: Routledge, 1999), 101.

the *imago dei* being the rationale behind the antithesis on oath-taking, it remains a possibility; one that would seem to be consistent with the context.

It is worth, at this point, returning to the question of marital ethics. It has been established already that when Jesus returns to the question of marriage and divorce in Matthew's narrative, his standards are explicitly drawn from the creation account and explicitly regard the Mosaic Torah, with its provision for divorce-certificates, as an inadequate reflection of creation. It is interesting to note that the teaching does not simply cite Gen 2:24 ("For this reason . . . et cetera") but also cites Gen 1:27 ("The Creator made them male and female"), the passage in which the *imago dei* is found. This suggests that this concept is important to the argument (although the phrase "in his image" is not quoted), which can be seen as redressing the inequity of rights for women (note that it is the man who commits adultery). Male and female are both in the image of God.

To summarise the argument thus far: no rationale is provided for Jesus' intensification of Torah in the so-called antitheses, but a study of the rest of the gospel and a sensitivity to parallel ethical standards elsewhere in the New Testament and in Judaism suggests that the ethical standards derive from the original design of creation.[283] Moreover, it is arguable that the standards are, more specifically, based upon the idea that man and woman are made in/as God's likeness. In support of this, we may now note a further structural feature: the language of "brother" creates an inclusio between the first and last antithesis. The inclusio, however, serves to focus attention on the radical nature of the final antithesis: love is not to be reserved for brothers, but is to be shown also to enemies. By drawing attention to the final antithesis, the inclusion also draws attention to its rationale, which as we have seen, is based upon the *imitatio/imago dei.* Thus, those who receive Jesus' teaching and put them into practice (7:24) recover a state of fidelity to creation's design plan. To return to an earlier point, and to anticipate a later one: the righteousness that exceeds that of the Scribes and the Pharisees (5:20) is one that reflects a true fidelity to the ethos of creation. Yet this recovery of creation represents only the inauguration of a restoration

[283] Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and his World of Thought*, (SNTSMS 41; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 81–83, argues that the antitheses simply reflect the principle of making a fence around the Law. Against this, however, it should be noted that Jesus in Matthew elsewhere condemns the Pharisees for laying heavy burdens upon men (23:4). Thus, some principle must be understood as being at work to determine what is to be seen as a legitimate intensification of Torah, what kind of "fencing" takes place.

that will be fully seen at the *parousia* (cf 19:28): at this point in time, there are still enemies to love and an evil one to lead the believer astray.

3. *Matthew 6:19–34: Earthly Goods, the Kingdom and the Restoration of the Creature-Creator Relationship*

A further section that may reflect the idea of restored creation, and which is of particular interest as it draws on both sapiential and apocalyptic elements, is found in 6:19–34. Two sub-sections within the pericope are linked by the subject matter of earthly goods and the kingdom (6:19–21, 25–34). This fact should caution the reader against seeing the latter section as *simply* a discussion of anxiety; it indicates that what we are actually dealing with is a discussion of what true kingdom-centeredness[284] (see 6:21) looks like and of the implications that such a centeredness should have on one's attitude to earthly goods.

Sandwiched between the two passages concerned with earthly goods is the discussion of the eye as the lamp of the body (6:22–23), which Matthew has relocated to this point in the Sermon.[285] At first glance, these verses seem to interrupt the flow of the material, but a closer examination reveals that they serve an important function within the whole unit. Although the terminology is, in my view, far too vague, Brooks' argument that what we are dealing with here is "apocalyptic paraenesis" (in which the light and darkness imagery reflect inner moral dualism), is suggestive and worth exploring.[286] Betz[287] and Allison[288] have both advocated the idea that the discussion of the eye as the lamp of the body reflects the idea of *extramission*[289] of light rather than *intromission*,[290] which only became standard after the fifteenth century. Allison in particular

---

[284] "The 'treasure' makes clear where the person's 'center' is located and what is most important to him or her." Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 396.

[285] The parallel occurrence is in Luke 11:34–36.

[286] S.H. Brooks, "Apocalyptic Paraenesis in Matthew 6:19–34," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. Louis Martyn*, (ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards JSNTSup 24; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

[287] Hans-Dieter Betz, "Matthew 6:22f and Ancient Greek Theories of Vision," in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black.* (ed. Ernest Best and Robert M. Wilson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 43–46.

[288] D.C. Allison, "The Eye is the Lamp of the Body (Matthew 6:22–23 = Luke 11:34–36)" *NTS* 33 (1987): 61–83.

[289] That is, the idea that sight involves light leaving the body through the eyes.

[290] "Intromission" is the idea that sight involves the entrance of light into the body through the eyes. This, of course, parallels modern understandings of the phenomenon of vision, which are so much a part of our own knowledge that we can be apt to forget that the ancient world did not conceive of sight in the same way.

has drawn on the Jewish background to this and suggested that the stress is on one's inner nature of light or darkness as something that is transmitted to the world through the eyes. Davies and Allison also provide a convincing argument against assuming that the condition of the protasis ("if your eye is good") is fulfilled in the apodosis ("then your whole body will be full of light"), citing Matthew 12:28 ("If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then the kingdom of heaven has come upon you") as an example of a "conditional sentence in which the causal condition is found not in the protasis but in the apodosis, and in which the protasis names the effect."[291] The use of the future tense (ἔσται), which is not sufficiently discussed by Davies-Allison, may serve a paraenetic function: strive towards attaining a state of inner light in the future by which one's eye will be good. The sense then would be: "when your whole body is full of light, *then* your eye is good."[292] Contextually it seems that ἁπλοῦς ("sound/healthy") should be given an ethical sense.[293] Contrasting the picture with that of the 'evil eye' in the Ancient Near East[294] (symbolic of greed), and relating ἁπλοῦς to the use of the cognate adverb ἁπλῶς in James 1:5, where it bears the sense 'generously,'[295] Hagner suggests that the image is of "an eye that is not attached to wealth, but is ready to part with it."[296]

Regardless of whether this last point is correct, the discussion above should have established one key point: the light or darkness associated with the eye is that of a person's inner being; it is not external to the person. Given this fact, the text reflects a light/darkness dualism similar to that seen in certain Qumran manuscripts, notably The Rule of the Community (1QS) 3–4, often referred to as the Treatise on the Two Spirits. As with Matthew 6:24, in which the impossibility of serving both God and Mammon[297] is stated, the stress in 1QS 3–4 falls on the

---

[291] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:637.

[292] It is interesting to note that the emphasis falls on "wholeness," on the thoroughgoing absence of darkness. Compare this to the idea in 4Q186 that even the good are stained by darkness to some degree.

[293] Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Waco: Word, 1982), takes the *good/bad* distinction as referring to "health" and "disease," but this is to ignore the strong ethical thrust of the passage as a whole.

[294] See G. Harder, "Πονηρός, Πονηρία" *TDNT* 6.555–6.

[295] This sense is also advocated for ἁπλοῦς by H.J. Cadbury, "The Single Eye," *HTR* 47 (1954), 69–74.

[296] Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 158.

[297] On the word "mammon," see J. Dupont, "Dieu ou Mammon, (Mt 6:24; Luke 16:13)" in his *Études sur les Évangiles synoptiques* (BETL 70; 2 vols; Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University, 1985), 2.551–67; R.T. France, "God and Mammon," *EvQ* 51 (1979),

service of two masters: the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness. The establishment of a righteous community and the transformation of that community into one of light, one aligned with the Prince of Lights and not the Angel of Darkness, is depicted as the restoration of Adam's glory, a restoration made possible by the understanding of the "wisdom of the sons of heaven" (1QS 4: 22–23).[298] The imagery of the good and bad eyes thus connects with ideas seen in a text that is sharply dualistic and in which the key ideas of revealed wisdom and restored creation are central.

The "good eye" passage in Matthew 6:22–23 is linked closely to 6:19–21 in two ways: first, a dualism runs through both sub-sections, between those who store up treasures on earth and in heaven, respectively, and between those whose inner natures are light and darkness, respectively. Second, the stress on the "heart" in 6:21 leads into the discussion of the eye as being the lamp from which one's inner state (symbolically, one's heart) shines out to the world. Contextually, this understanding would seem to suggest that the importance of the "eye" is that it symbolises what one's attention is focused on, an understanding consonant with the view put forward by Hagner, above, and appropriate to the negative background of the "evil eye" in the Ancient Near East.[299] Thus, one's attitude to earthly goods reflects one's inner nature, whether it be light or darkness. Matthew 6:24 drives this dualism home in a way that stresses what is to be rejected: "you cannot serve both God and Mammon" emphasises that the dualism relates to an improper elevation of the things of this world to the status of "master." Matthew 6:19–24, then, warns of the need for a proper attitude towards the earth and its goods in the context of an absolute dualism.

Moving into 6:25–34, however, the emphasis shifts onto the disciples' anxiety over earthly goods. In urging his disciples to have the correct attitude to earthly possessions, Jesus points them in the direction of the birds of the air and the flowers of the field.[300] Clearly the primary function of

---

3–21. Differently, B.A. Mastin, "Latin Mam(m)ona and the Semitic Languages: a False Trail and a Suggestion." *Biblica* 65 (1984), 87–90.

[298] Hebrew: חכמה בני שמים.

[299] This interpretation is followed by Charette, *The Theme of Recompense*, 102–3, who also notes the presence, in 20:15, of a reference to the eyes of the disgruntled vineyard workers as being "evil." This reference implies that "envy" or "greed" are indeed the key referents of the "evil eye."

[300] On the use of natural analogies in wisdom literature, see the brief discussion in chapter 1. It is perhaps worth noting Goff's observation that *4QInstruction*, despite giving

this is to teach the disciples the nature of God's fatherly care,[301] yet there is also an important sense in which the birds and the flowers model a proper harmony of Creator and creature for the disciples.[302] There is, perhaps, an intentional irony in the text: the birds do not sow or reap, yet they are fed by the Heavenly Father; the flowers do not labour or spin, yet they are clothed by the Heavenly Father; but the pagans "run after these things," elevating Mammon to the position of Master (a position that only God should occupy), and as such have no promise that "these things will be given" to them by a Heavenly Father.

Two points should be noted. First, while commentators have sought to find a background to this passage in Proverbs 6:6–11,[303] the emphasis on God's fatherly care and provision for the birds and flowers bears more similarity to Job 38:39–39:30 and Psalm 147:8–9, where also it is the non-domestic species that are the objects of consideration. This accords also with the paraenetic function of the passage in Matthew: not to encourage activity, as Proverbs does, but rather to encourage trust in God's fatherly provision. The focus on the non-domestic species in Job 38:39–39:30 has been seen by William P. Brown as intended to challenge Job's depiction of these same animals as symbolic of his own outcast and derelict status:[304] by stressing God's providential care of the animals and, just as importantly, their inherent dignity, God challenges Job's self-image and his perception of his own status.[305] In illustrating its point by means of non-domestic species of plant and animal, Matthew

---

pre-eminence to רז נהיה, continues to draw insights from nature (*Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 52–3).

[301] Note the language of fatherhood in Matt 6:26&32.

[302] See J.F. Healey "Models of Behavior: Matt 6:26 (// Luke 12:24) and Prov 6:6–8." *JBL* 108 (1989): 497–498.

[303] See Healey, "Models," for this approach. John N. Jones, " 'Think of the Lilies' and Prov 6:6–11," *HTR* 88 (1995), 175–77, argues that the passage in Matthew deliberately inverts the meaning of Prov 6:6–11, which is certainly consistent with the point made in this chapter.

[304] Brown, *The Ethos of the Cosmos: the Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 317–77.

[305] It is possible that 6:27 is concerned with *stature*, depending on how one understands ἡλικίαν. Luz, *Matthew 1–7*, 406, takes this as a reference to height as does, with some caution, Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Leicester: Inter Varsity Press, 1992), 158–9. Against these, however, Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 1:651–652 and Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 164, take the noun as referring to "age" and thus life-span. Luz's argument that, when referring to age, ἡλικίαν always refers to a definite quantity of age, rather than an open ended idea of *life-span* (thus, in the present context, favouring his view that the term here refers to stature) is not answered by any following the alternative interpretation.

While Luz's understanding of ἡλικίαν would reinforce my suggestion that status is in view in Mat 6:27, it remains the case that the noun more normally refers to "age." This does not mean that status issues are not operative in the context; it simply means that they are not the point of this verse, about which more shall be said below.

6:25–34 may reflect similar concerns: the reader is not to be concerned with chasing after the things the pagans pursue (might clothes and food represent status?), for what is needful will be given by God (6:32) in his capacity as Father. Thus, the "status" of the reader, an issue of some importance to a Jewish-Christian readership in possible conflict with a Jewish parent group, is not to be a source of anxiety.

Second, this advice is not a universal lesson drawn from creation, but is a specific eschatological teaching to the elect reader. It is those who "seek first the kingdom and his righteousness" (6:33) that can rest in the knowledge that what is needful will be given to them. Both of these elements take us back to the opening sections of the Sermon on the Mount. In the beatitudes, the "kingdom" (βασιλεία) is presented as the eschatological possession of the remnant, and "righteousness" is one of their characteristics, indeed, it is something that they thirst for. Returning to an earlier point, the righteousness that exceeds that of the Pharisees, is one that reflects a true fidelity to the ethos of creation. Those who display such righteousness enjoy security *within* that creation.

In drawing this together, the point of the section is that the disciple is to have the correct attitude to worldly goods and that this attitude should involve complete trust in God's providential care. The birds of the air are held up as an example of the correct attitude and behaviour and are thus depicted as being in proper harmony with their Creator and Provider. Against this, those who "run after these things," are centred in the wrong place: their fixation on earthly things means that they are disjoined from the care of the Creator of that earth. The point of the image, therefore, is again suggestive of a properly restored relationship with the Creator.

Is There an Eschatological Sub-Text in Matthew 6:19–34?

This much lies on the surface of the text. However, it is possible that there is a dimension to this passage that has tended to be overlooked by scholars. This dimension is only appreciated when one acknowledges the presence of certain logical problems in the very structure of the argument; problems that, I would suggest, are intended to cause the reader to reflect upon more subtle aspects of Jesus' teaching.

There are two such problems. First, as Luz notes, "every 'starved sparrow' refutes Jesus."[306] Second, and more important, the flow of the

[306] *Matthew 1–7*, 402. His point draws on J. Weiss , *Das Matthäus-Evangelium*, (SNT 1, 2nd. ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, 1907), 293.

part of the argument concerned with the "flowers of the field" is logically problematic if it is understood as referring to any kind of present-time clothing with glory. The argument suggests that Solomon's greatest splendour is less than that of the flowers' clothing (οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἓν τούτων) and goes on to argue from lesser to greater: "if God so clothes the grass of the field, which today is in the field and tomorrow is cast into the oven, how much more you, oh ye of little faith?"[307] Yet it is quite obvious that none of Jesus' hearers and, surely, of Matthew's readers would possess clothing that exceeds the thing that exceeds the splendour of Solomon.

Three possibilities present themselves. 1) The argument may be superficial or general and, therefore, to modern sensibilities at least, flawed. 2) The argument may reflect some idea of 'moral' clothing, roughly corresponding to language found elsewhere in the New Testament. 3) The argument may suggest some idea of future clothing with glory at the time of the eschatological reversal.

The following arguments are offered in support of the third possibility:

1. The context provided by 6:19–21 suggests that the reader is to be concerned with what lasts; that is, with heavenly treasures that will never succumb to moth, rust and thieves. Thus, the emphasis is on a realm that, unlike this transient Earth, is eternal. This points the reader in an eschatological direction.
2. The context provided by 7:1–2 is one of judgement. While this is not necessarily a reference to the Great Judgement, the reader of the Sermon on the Mount as a whole—even more so the reader of Matthew as a whole—would surely see some kind of allusion being made to the final judgement, even if only on a secondary level. Thus on both sides, the passage is set in a context of future eschatological events.
3. Matthew's redaction of the "eye" saying to this point in the text, interrupting an otherwise natural flow of material concerned with possessions, introduces dualistic light/darkness language into the text.
4. Elsewhere in the New Testament, the idea of a future clothing in glorious heavenly garments is found. The most notable examples are 2 Cor 5:1–5 and Revelation 3:4–5.

[307] Translation follows Davies-Allison, *Matthew* 1:651.

As mentioned in previous chapters, Alexander Golitzin has examined this idea in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Syriac Christian mystical writings from the 4th century,[308] noting the presence in each group of texts of a cluster of ideas associated with Adamic glory. These ideas include the restoration of the divine glory, the fellowship of the redeemed with the angels, the bestowal of garments of glory or light and the vision of the divine glory. Some citations from the Rule of the Community (1QS) may remind us how they operate:

> These are the counsels of the spirit for the sons of truth in the world. And the visitation of those who walk in it will be for healing, plentiful peace in a long life, fruitful offspring with all everlasting blessings, eternal enjoyment with endless life, and a crown of glory with majestic raiment in eternal light. (1QS 4:6–8).

In this way the upright will understand knowledge of the Most High, and the wisdom of the sons of heaven will teach those of perfect behaviour. For these are those selected by God for an everlasting covenant and to them shall belong all the glory of Adam. (1QS 4:22–23)[309]

The similarity of the light/darkness imagery in Matthew 6:22–3 with 1QS 3&4, the passage cited in part above, has already been noticed. The fact that we have in Matthew 6:19–34 a reference to being clothed with splendour, in the context of a light/darkness dualism that runs through the whole section, seems to suggest that we are in the same thought world as that found in 1QS 3&4 and studied more widely by Golitzin. To sum up: the eschatological context and the conceptual similarity with 1QS 3&4, increased by Matthew's insertion of the discussion of the eye as the lamp of the body at this point in the material, may suggest that something similar to the concept of "the glory of Adam," seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Syriac Christian writings, undergirds this text.

Certainty regarding whether such a reading is intended is, of course, impossible. But it is interesting that when this reading is configured into the passage as a whole, the effect is to cast the whole passage into a fresh eschatological light and to explain some of the more subtle aspects of its language. Specifically, the Greek of the last part of 6:25 is literally "Is not life more than (πλεῖόν) food and the body [more than] the garment?" The NIV rendering of this ("is not life more important than . . .")

---

[308] See Alexander Golitzin, "Recovering the Glory of Adam."

[309] Translation taken from F. García Martínez *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 6–7.

interprets πλεῖόν as implying the word 'important' and inserts the word into the text. Yet, if the parallel argument, concerning the lilies of the field (6:28–30), is understood as referring to an eschatological clothing with glory, the more literal translation of verse 29 makes perfect sense: life is indeed *more* than food and the body *more* than clothing, for both of these things are part of the present world and each person's horizon extends beyond that world and into eternity. Similarly, the warning of verse 27, "who of you by worrying can add a single hour to his life,"[310] now links much more closely with 6:19–21: since worrying cannot add to the span of one's life, it is all the more important to be ready for, and aligned with, the eternal kingdom of God. Finally, the promise "Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness and all these things will be given to you as well," now connects much more closely with both 6:19–21 and, indeed, the rest of chapter 6, in which the idea of the "reward" is so dominant. The approach that sees Matthew 6:25–34 simply as an extended exhortation not to be anxious, rather than as a fundamentally eschatological text, fails to explain Matthew's arrangement of the material and to acknowledge the conceptual associations that the ideal reader ought to make on the basis of this arrangement.

To conclude our study of Matthew 6:19–34: This part of the Sermon on the Mount has, at its heart, the idea of a restored relationship with the Creator. By drawing upon creation-imagery as providing models for obedience, the section not only identifies itself with traditional Jewish wisdom, it also depicts obedience as a matter of fidelity to patterns within creation. Furthermore, the text teaches that the disciple has a proper attitude to earthly goods by virtue of his or her inner nature being one of light. This idea, understood against the background of the "recovered glory of Adam" traditions, could in itself imply a restored creation. But such an idea is both developed and refined by the eschatological sub-text of the section: while one's inner nature may, here and now, be one of restored light or glory, only in the age to come will the glorious splendour of Adam be truly recovered. Thus, the text would seem to reflect the "inaugurated" character of the eschatology I have argued for; any suggestions of a fully realised eschatology are incapable of dealing with the aspects of the text that have been outlined here.[311]

---

[310] There is, of course, a translation issue with this verse, which can also be rendered as "add a single cubit to his height." A brief discussion of this issue is given above.

[311] It is interesting to compare my conclusions, with regard to creation-patterns and ethics, with those of Markus Bockmuehl in his "Natural Law in the New Testament," in

Conclusions

A significant amount of evidence points to the fact that Matthew's eschatology, like that of the Enochic material and *4QInstruction*, is also inaugurated, and that it centres upon the revealing of wisdom to an elect group. Such an understanding of Matthew's theology seems to do better justice to the variegated character of the gospel—its strongly sapiential and strongly apocalyptic character—than does the "Wisdom Christology" seen by some scholars. As with the previous two texts studied, Matthew's notion of revealed wisdom has two dimensions: there is a revealer-figure who discloses a body of truth and there is the divine enabling of understanding, without which that body of truth remains opaque. Under the influence of such a soteriological paradigm, it is unsurprising to find sapiential, prophetic and apocalyptic elements juxtaposed, fused and hybridised, phenomena better explained by my model of revealed wisdom and inaugurated eschatology than by the Wisdom-Christology approach. While less certain than this eschatological emphasis, it is also possible that Matthew shares with *4QInstruction* the idea that the revealed wisdom needed for salvation enables the elect to live according to the will of the Creator, to live within a renewed Edenic oasis.

Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), especially 122–6. Bockmuehl notes that while much of Jesus' ethical teaching seems to be linked to natural order, elements of it, particularly those concerned with the family, give priority to the Kingdom over creation. He concludes (126): "For the Jesus tradition, the moral order of creation is part of the will of God; and yet the *right reading* of creation is not self-authenticating, but remains contingent on the perspective of the Kingdom." This point seems similar to that which I have argued: creation is seen as providing the patterns for right living, but only when set within a particular eschatological context.

CHAPTER FIVE

2 (SLAVONIC APOCALYPSE OF) ENOCH

The text known as *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch* is known only from a number of manuscripts written in various dialects of Church Slavonic[1] and dating from the 14th–18th centuries. The oldest of these manuscripts is the fourteenth century ethical treatise *Merilo Pravednoe* ("The Scales of Justice"). This document, however, contains a heavily edited and reworked version of *2 Enoch* and, therefore, while being the oldest witness to the work it is also the witness of a very late stage in its transmission. Thus, one of the view points universally agreed by scholars is that *2 Enoch* significantly pre-dates the 14th century. The manuscripts bear witness to two primary recensions of the work, generally known as the longer and shorter recensions, although if we are to be precise there are, in fact four recensions: very long, long, short and very short.[2] Vaillant, in his critical edition of the text[3] made the judgement that, for the most part, the shorter recension was original and relegated the material of the longer recension to an appendix, regarding it as the work of a later redactor. Against Vaillant, however, Böttrich made the simple statement that "spätere Kürzungen müssen nicht mit früheren Erweiterungen identisch sein,"[4] a comment that exposed a major methodological problem with Vaillant's approach and reminds us that there is no avoiding the difficult process of weighing up each point in the text and its diverse witnesses in order to establish which reading might be original.[5]

---

[1] The manuscripts fall outside of the defined period within which Slavists will speak of *Old* Church Slavonic and reflect later linguistic development into the regional Slavic languages.

[2] See Francis I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *OTP* 1.92–221. Comments on the recensions are found on page 93.

[3] A. Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets D'Henoch: Texte Slave et Traduction Française*, (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952).

[4] C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*, (WUNT 2:50; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 56. The statement is part of a wider discussion (54–56) in which he argues that it is too simplistic to identify either recension as the "Grundstock" of *2 Enoch*.

[5] For Böttrich, however, this statement is made as part of his argument for the priority of the longer recension, an argument that I am unconvinced by. See the discussion below.

Also problematic was Vaillant's suggestion that the work was a Christian revision of the Jewish Enoch traditions (that is, *1 Enoch*): as Francis I. Andersen notes "very little can be demonstrated by way of direct connection between the two works, and the divergences are numerous and substantial. In particular, *1 Enoch* has an interest in history not present in *2 Enoch*, while *2 Enoch* has an interest in creation not present in *1 Enoch*."[6] Even in the extensive calendrical details found in *2 Enoch*, there is little that seems to have been directly lifted from the Book of the Luminaries. This is not to categorically reject Christian authorship—more will be said on this below—but it is to stress that the question of the relationship between the two Enochic texts is not one of simple dependency; a proper answer to this question must await the results of the present scholarly interest in the Enochic texts and the traditions that may have lain behind their development.

In fact, as Orlov[7] notes, "contemporary scholarship still does not furnish a consensus concerning the possible provenance of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*."[8] Hugely divergent suggestions have been put forward: Milik claimed the work was written by a 10th century Byzantine monk,[9] while Charles had classically seen it as the work of a Hellenized Jew in Alexandria.[10] Interacting with the findings of earlier research, Böttrich proposed a rather complex process of development: from an original turn-of-the-era Jewish work, through Jewish-mystical and then Byzantine expansion and then later editing back into what is now the shorter recension.[11]

My own contribution to this dilemma has been to apply James Davila's methodological criteria for distinguishing Jewish and Christian works[12]

---

[6] Francis I. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 95.

[7] I will refer often in this chapter to articles by Andrei Orlov, who has published extensively on *2 Enoch*. Much of the material originally published in these articles has, since I first wrote this chapter, appeared in his monograph, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). I will continue, however, to reference the original articles. I am deeply grateful to Professor Orlov for his willingness to assist me in the difficult process of obtaining copies of the manuscripts of *2 Enoch*.

[8] Andrei Orlov, "The Melchizedek Legend of *2 Enoch*," *JSJ* 31, (2000), 23–38. For the various views on the origins of *2 Enoch*, see Orlov's footnote 1, page 23 or the discussion in C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 20–54.

[9] See J.T. Milik with the collaboration of Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

[10] R.H. Charles, "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, (2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 1. 425.

[11] Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 108–130.

[12] James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (JSJ-Supp 105, Leiden: Brill, 2005).

to the text in order to seek to ascertain whether the work is Jewish or Christian.[13] While hopefully bringing the crucial questions into sharper focus, even this research, however, has failed to yield conclusive evidence as to its origins (although the findings suggest that Jewish authorship seems more likely than Christian).

If scholars wish to make use of *2 Enoch* as "background" to the New Testament or in reconstructing ancient Judaism, then this lack of certainty is a real problem. However, it seems to me that scholarship has largely neglected a much less controversial dimension of the significance of *2 Enoch*, namely that it bears witness to the ongoing transmission of ideas in Christian contexts. If the eschatological emphases that we have seen in previous texts in this study may be observed also in *2 Enoch*, then that fact will demonstrate that such ideas continued to be transmitted in Christian contexts in subsequent centuries.[14] This, of course, leaves open the question of whether those ideas were consciously processed or a text containing them simply copied with little thought. The latter seems intrinsically unlikely, however: it is more likely that texts would be copied and transmitted because some measure of significance was seen in the ideas they contained. I shall address this question further below.

Establishing a Core of 2 Enoch

The most extensive study of the transmission of *2 Enoch* is that of Christfried Böttrich, who provides an excellent and thorough account of the development of the debate concerning the apocalypse's origins, thus dispensing with the weaker arguments for a late date and for the simplistic assumption of the priority of the shorter recension.[15] Based on this survey, Böttrich favours the idea that the work is early and probably of Alexandrian origin.[16] He then goes on to reconstruct

[13] In 2005, I gave a paper at the British New Testament Conference, entitled, "2 (Slavonic) Enoch and the New Testament: Methodological Problems and a Possible Way Ahead." I have since developed the arguments presented there and hope soon to begin to publish a number of articles that will explore some of the crucial issues, such as the nature and function of the calendrical material (does it have a polemical dimension?) and the character of the sacrificial references (are they Christian projections?).

[14] *2 Enoch* is hardly unique in this regard, of course: many Old Testament pseudepigrapha have been transmitted in Christian contexts, including *1 Enoch*. The Slavonic pseudepigrapha, though, bear fascinating witness to the Eastern Christian (Byzantine) environment in particular.

[15] Christfried Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 20–56.

[16] Ibid., 55, 108.

a possible transmission-history of the work, identifying Jewish-Mystical expansions,[17] early Christian expansions[18] and Byzantine Chronographic expansions,[19] before identifying traces of dependence upon *2 Enoch* in certain early works. I shall summarise these possible expansions briefly as they will provide helpful inroads into the question of which parts of the book are secondary.

Jewish-Mystical Expansions

These comprise: a) the mention of the 8–10th heavens in 20:3 and 21:6–22:3; b) the biographical details of Enoch given in 68:1–4 (longer recension); c) the description of Enoch as one who has seen God's face in 39:1–4; d) the passage concerning the earthly king in 46:1–3. Andrei Orlov has challenged point (c) in particular, arguing that 39:1–4 is part of the polemical structure of *2 Enoch*.[20]

Early-Christian Expansions

These comprise: a) a number of calendrical details;[21] b) the depiction of Michael as ἀρχιστράτηγος (sl: *arxistratigŭ*) in 22:6, 33:10 and (in some mss) in 71:28, 72:4,5; c) the Satanael-Satan reference in 31:4; d) the reference to vows in 49:1–2 (parallel to Matt 5:37); e) the reference to Adam living in Eden for 7 years in 71:28; f) the seemingly Christological reference in 71:32–37 to a final priest who will excel all others, the Word and Power of God; g) the chronographic details about Melkisedek given in 72:6–7.

---

[17] Ibid., 109–114.
[18] Ibid., 114–125.
[19] Ibid., 125–130.
[20] See Andrei Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *JSJ* 34 (2003), 274–303.
[21] The specific details in question are:
1. The Julianic year of 364 ¼ days (14:1; 16:4,6). The actual total of the number of days mentioned in Chapter 16 is 364, though the way in which the figure is broken down into months varies among the witnesses.
2. The calendrical cycle of 28 years (15:4).
3. The "Metonic cycle" of 19 years (16:8).
4. The lunar epacts (16:5).
5. The "Great cycle" of 532 years (16:5), after which the moveable festivals fall on the same day of the month and of the week.

Byzantine Chronographic Expansions

These comprise: a) chapter 73; b) the reference in 22:11 to the heavenly books as *zmureniemi*, which Milik saw as being derived from the Greek word συρμαιόγραφος, a 9th century neologism meaning "to write in miniscule (quickly),"[22] but which Böttrich sees as a Byzantine scribe's interpolation, altered by the Slavonic translator to become a reference to myrhh. c) The reference to the Phoenixes in 19:6, which Böttrich regards as a rewriting of an earlier reference to "ophanim"; d) Chapter 70:24–25.

That Böttrich has correctly identified these as secondary elements in *2 Enoch* seems likely to me,[23] with the exception of the divine face imagery in 39:1–4, which Orlov has argued to belong to the core of the book (see above, n. 20). I will, as a consequence, seek to avoid drawing any conclusions from these sections. In some ways, of course, they are of special interest as witnesses to the specific thought of the tradents; but this must be balanced by the fact that they are often present only in the longer recension and by the possibility that they were interpolated at a late stage. If we are seeking to establish a core of ideas transmitted in all of the contexts through which *2 Enoch* has passed, then we must avoid them.

For the sake of the present study, however, I will go slightly further than either Böttrich or Orlov in excluding material. We lack, at present, an adequate critical edition of the Slavonic text of *2 Enoch*, such as would allow us to make the kind of judgements necessary to establish the originality of either longer or shorter recensions.[24] Böttrich, who has worked closely with the textual witnesses, would dispute this: he has argued strongly that the longer recension ought to be given priority.[25] His argument revolves around several strands of internal evidence.[26] He suggests, first, that the secondary character of the shorter recension is seen most clearly in the creation account of 28:1–33:2:

---

[22] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 109.

[23] I am not convinced, however, that the Jewish-Mystical expansions need to have been the work of Jewish mystics. They could easily have been the result of Christian interpolation.

[24] I am currently preparing such an edition, but it will be several years before it is ready for publication.

[25] See *Weltweisheit*, 59–107. The argument is summarised in his article, "The Melchizedek Story of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*: A Reaction to Andrei Orlov," *JSJ* 32 (2001), 448–49.

[26] Böttrich also notes an important piece of *external* evidence, suggesting that under the threat of "a more and more complete 'Index of the Apocrypha,' the texts had to face often strong, partly also mechanical, interventions; the fragment MPr is an impressive

> In the longer recension it is a well-rounded unit, carefully woven together with other parts of the book, constructed under a plausible theological concept. In the shorter recension this part is given as a torso (containing a fifth of the verses only) without a clear conception.[27]

In reply, however, we could ask: why should it not be the case that the sparseness of the account in the shorter recension has left a scribe uncomfortable and prompted him to introduce new material to supplement this? In fact, there may be good reason for believing this to be the case: very similar material to that which is found in these chapters is known to have circulated independently in works such as the *Adam Octipartite*, attested in Latin, Old Irish and (significantly) Church Slavonic,[28] as Böttrich himself has noted.[29] The range of languages in which it is attested points to the age of this material. Was it originally part of *2 Enoch* before it came to circulate independently or was the direction of dependence the other way round? This requires further study, but Böttrich himself, in the context of a discussion of this very tradition, has noted how unlikely it is that *2 Enoch* as a book was ever known in the Western tradition.[30] In his view, this material must at some stage have been loosed from its original context in the apocalypse. As far as I can see, however, he nowhere demonstrates this adequately or thoroughly refutes the possibility that the material may have originated outside

---

example of the total rearrangement of the text." ("The Melchizedek Story," 448, n. 16). This may be true, but such external evidence must be carefully evaluated in terms of internal evidence, with the latter bearing the weight of the argument. I am not sure that Böttrich does this. I would also suggest that his mention of MPr (*Merilo Pravednoe*) as an example of "the total rearrangement of the text" is slightly inappropriate to the point he is making: this text is a juridical collection and the highly condensed form of *2 Enoch* that occurs in it seems to have been rearranged with a view to isolating juridical elements, not as a consequence of the suppressive influence of an emerging index of the apocrypha.

[27] "The Melchizedek Story," 448.

[28] See M. McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975), 21–23, who discusses the extent to which these traditions are seen in Irish exegetical traditions; M. Förster, "Die mittelirische Version von Adams Erschaffung," *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 13 (1921), 47–48; idem, "Adam's Erschaffung und Namengebung: Ein lateinisches Fragment des s.g. slawischen Henoch," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1907–8) 477–529; V. Jagić, "Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (Vienna, 1893), 44–47.

[29] C. Böttrich, *Adam als Microcosmos: Eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 1995), 7–15 (on *Adam Octipartite*, see 10–12).

[30] Ibid., 12 n. 29.

of *2 Enoch*.[31] Böttrich may well be correct in his conclusions, but his argumentation is not, at this stage, adequate and we should, I think, be suspicious of the material until its integrity within *2 Enoch* has been thoroughly demonstrated.

The remaining points in Böttrich's argument concern a number of places where he has seen the shorter account as being altered or abbreviated (notably 71:32–37, from which manuscripts of the shorter recension may have excised verses 35 and 36, and 72:6–7). It is not my intention to challenge these—again, Böttrich may well be correct—but it does not follow from these that the longer recension is consistently more original than the longer; it is noteworthy that where calendrical interpolations are found, it is consistently the longer recension that contains these. In my view, Böttrich's arguments have not demonstrated the originality of the longer recension, but rather the secondary nature of *both* longer and shorter. At any given point, either could be closer to the original, and in the absence of a good critical edition it is very difficult to assess the relative merits of each.

It seems wisest, therefore, to restrict ourselves, for the time being, to readings that are attested across the recensions. This will, to a large extent, mean ignoring material from the longer recension—such as a great deal of the detail in the creation account (24–33)—but it does not simply mean using the shorter recension, which on occasion contains more detail than the longer (39:1–4, discussed above is a case in point, although I think it probably *is* original). I shall endeavour, in what remains of this chapter, to observe this principle; if at any point I cite the longer recension, it is for reasons of readability, and because I believe that in the given citation both it and the shorter recension are essentially communicating the same idea.

The Route of Transmission of 2 Enoch

On the strength of his discussion of the expansion of *2 Enoch*, and in the light of his survey of previous research into the apocalypse, Böttrich proposes that the route of transmission of *2 Enoch* was from Alexandria (in the first century) to Palestine (where it was expanded by the Jewish mystics) then into Christian circles (attracted by the Melchizedek

[31] The detailed discussion of the creation account in *2 Enoch* (ibid., 48–53) includes some interaction with the articles by Förster mentioned above, but no critical defence of the suggestion that the material is original to *2 Enoch*.

material) through which it was eventually transmitted into Byzantine circles. Two methodological problems may be raised with his proposal. First, dating and locating the expansions in the way Böttrich does seems dangerous: we can certainly establish earliest possible dates for some of the interpolated material (such as the calendrical details), but we cannot establish that just because an idea *could* be early that it necessarily was so. Second, Böttrich's proposal essentially *assumes* a starting point of early Diaspora Judaism on the basis of his survey of the history of the debate over the origins of *2 Enoch*, but few would regard this debate as having reached a satisfactory conclusion. To quote again the words of Orlov: "contemporary scholarship still does not furnish a consensus concerning the possible provenance of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*."[32]

If we confine ourselves to the period that is attested by textual witnesses, the route of transmission that we can identify is from Byzantine Christian circles into the Slavic environment, within which at least some of the manuscripts were altered at the hands of the Bogomils or a similar group. The evidence for this is fairly straightforward: all of our manuscripts for *2 Enoch* are in Church Slavonic, but most works of this kind have been translated from Greek. That this is the case with *2 Enoch* may be supported by the ADAM acronym in chapter 30, which works only in Greek.[33] It is worth noting also the presence of close parallels to *2 Enoch* in a 13th century Byzantine text, the *Disputation of an Orthodox with a Latin*,[34] which are discussed by Böttrich[35] and would seem to provide further support for the transmission of the work in Byzantine circles.[36] As for traces of Bogomil transmission, these may be found in chapter 31, where Andersen notes the presence of two Slavonic puns. In the first, the devil becomes a "demon" (*běsŭ*) because he "fled" (*bě že*); his name is then changed from Satanail to Sotona, the latter appearing to be a second pun, playing on the word for "make" or "create" (*sŭtvoriti*), which occurs in a difficult intervening phrase that seems to suggest that

[32] Andrei Orlov, "The Melchizedek Legend of *2 Enoch*," *JSJ* 31, (2000), 23–38. For the various views on the origins of *2 Enoch*, see Orlov's footnote 1, page 23 or the discussion in C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 20–54.

[33] See Andersen, "2 Enoch," 152.

[34] Or *Panagiotae cum Azymita Disputatio*. The Greek text of this work is found in A. Vasil'ev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina I* (Moscow: Sumptibus et Typis Universitatis Caesareae, 1893).

[35] *Weltweisheit*, 139–142.

[36] Again, however, the possibility exists that the *Disputatio* contains traditions later integrated into *2 Enoch*. This warrants further research at a later stage; again, though, it is research that must await a proper critical edition of the Slavonic text.

the devil created heaven "(or at least his own, the lowest, heaven)."[37] This certainly points to alteration of the text in a Slavic context, and possibly to Bogomil thought, but it is noteworthy that the passage in question is found only in the longer recension.

To conclude, the only verifiable route of transmission that can be demonstrated for *2 Enoch* is from Byzantine Christian circles into Slavdom, within which it was probably transmitted by Bogomils, though not exclusively.

Points of Similarity between 2 Enoch *and Matthew*

Why, though, was *2 Enoch* transmitted in Christian circles? The question is impossible to answer, although it may well be that it was regarded as authoritative Scripture by some Christians. A more helpful question to ask is: why was *this* form of the Enochic tradition passed-on in certain Christian circles rather than that of *1 Enoch*? Again, this question is impossible to answer fully, but its solution may lie in part with some interesting similarities between *2 Enoch* and Matthew's Gospel.

First, In *2 Enoch* 8–10, two descriptions are given: one of Paradise (8:1–9:1) and the other of the place of judgement (10:1–6). Alongside the descriptions of the places are given fairly detailed descriptions of those for whom these places have been prepared. There are obvious similarities in the structure of the section with Matthew 25:31–46, where also a dualistic description of the righteous and the sinners is found. In the case of *2 Enoch* 9, Andersen notes several specific points of more striking similarity:

> (1) The designation "righteous"; (2) the idea of a "prepared" place; (3) the ethical measures; (4) the arrangement of the virtuous actions in pairs.[38]

But he also notes that there are numerous differences "apart from the capital one, that the son of Man is the Judge:"

> (1) The setting is quite different; (2) the good deeds in Mt are exclusively humanitarian, whereas 2 En has religious duties and the endurance of persecution; (3) in fact there are only two in common—relieving hunger and nakedness. The community which used 2 En 9 as its code was more self-consciously pious than the community of Mt 25. Its simple ethical monotheism would fit "God-fearers" anywhere.[39]

---

[37] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 154.
[38] "2 Enoch," 116.
[39] Ibid., 116.

Also noteworthy as a point of difference between *2 Enoch* 8–10 and Matthew 25:31–46 is the fact that, in the former text, there is not the same direct correspondence between the positive virtues and the sinful actions as in Matthew, even though there are certain points of overlap (such as death by/causing starvation and enduring/failing to remedy nakedness, where the second of each of these pairs occurs as a sin in chapter 10). There is, then, a strong resemblance between *2 Enoch* and Matthew at this point, but also a level of variance that makes theories of simple dependence problematic.

A second point at which a similarity may be detected between the two texts is in the use of series of beatitudes in *2 Enoch* 42:6–14 and Matthew 5:3–11. The point is of particular note since this arrangement of beatitudes is unique within the gospel traditions to Matthew, the parallel material in Luke being found in the form of contrastive blessings and woes.[40] Furthermore, in both texts, the form is strongly connected with eschatology, as will be seen in the discussions below. Again, however, there are substantial differences, most notably that the material in the gospel tradition is somewhat paradoxical ("happy is the one who mourns"), while the material in *2 Enoch* simply pronounces blessed the one who behaves according to a certain pattern of ethical behaviour. The similarity, then, lies in not in the detail of the individual beatitudes but in the use of this form in a series, conceptually linked to eschatological material.

A third point of similarity is found in *2 Enoch* 44 and Matthew 5:22. The similarity here lies in the concern for human dignity and in the protection of that dignity against attack in the form of anger or contempt; in both texts, there is an emphasis that such attacks will be subject to divine judgement. Formally, however, the two are quite distinct: Matthew 5:22 occurs in the context of the so-called antitheses, in which there is an explicit dialogue with convention (possibly with Torah itself),[41] while the material in *2 Enoch* comprises a series of ethical conclusions drawn from the doctrine of *imago dei*, concluding in a beatitude upon those who show concern for fellow humans.

A similar point arises in the series of blessings/curses in *2 Enoch* 52, in which the macarisms are pronounced on the one who praises and blesses the LORD (52:1,3) and glorifies his works (52:5), while the curses

[40] To my knowledge, the only other place where such a series is found is in 4Q525.

[41] See the discussion in chapter 4, where the presence of a similar idea in James 3:9 is noted.

are pronounced upon the one who insults and slanders his neighbour (52:2) and insults the creatures of the LORD (52:6). The point would seem to parallel that seen in *2 Enoch* 44 and Matthew 5:22: a respect for God entails a respect for that which he has made, especially those who are made in his image. It is interesting to note, further, that as the series of blessings and curses progresses in *2 Enoch* 52, it becomes concerned with the making—or destroying—of peace (52:11–14), a concern that parallels the beatitude "blessed are the peacemakers" in Matthew 5:9. As before, the parallels with Matthew are striking, not least in the use of beatitudes, but not absolute.

A final point that may be made with regard to similarities between the two works concerns the stylistic arrangement of material. This connects with the second similarity noted above—the use of a series of beatitudes—but is here noted in a more general sense. It is striking in the case of both works that there is a developed stylistic arrangement of the ethical material that seems intentionally to emulate the kind of stylistic arrangements seen in wisdom books such as Sirach and Ecclesiastes.[42] Thus in Matthew, the teaching of Jesus has been gathered into blocks and those blocks in turn show stylistic arrangement: there is a series of beatitudes (5:3–11), a series of antitheses (5:21–48), a series of ethical teachings linked by the phrase "your father who is in secret" and by the idea of the reward (6:1–18); there is also a cluster of parables linked by the idea of the Kingdom (13:3–52), a series of woes (23:13–36) and another series of parables dealing in a different sense with the Kingdom (24:45–25:46). The arrangement is far more stylised and formal than the teaching material in Luke, where parallels with Matthew occur. Similarly in *2 Enoch*, there are series of beatitudes (42:6–14; 61:1–63:1), macarism/curse series (52), discourses (43; 44:1–2; 58; 65) and groups of fatherly admonitions (53:1–4; 61:1–2; 66). Thus, both works present their ethical teaching using highly stylised arrangements reminiscent of the wisdom tradition.[43]

Without overstating the evidence, it is worth noting the words of Andersen:

---

[42] It will be recalled from chapter 1 that such stylistic arrangement is one of the characteristics of wisdom literature.

[43] Further points of minor correspondence could be noted between the two texts, as Andersen does, but these similarities are, in my view, less striking than those noted above.

> 2 En comes closer in language and ideas to Mt than to any other part of the NT; but it does not resemble Rev, as might have been expected. It is more likely that Mt and 2 En have a similar milieu than that a later Christian author of 2 En was influenced by only one book of the NT.[44]

Andersen may be correct, but what interests me more at this point is the fact that the similarities between the two texts would allow a Christian reader to integrate more closely Enoch's revelation with that of Jesus, whether seeing Enoch as a forerunner of Jesus or seeing Jesus as the one who would reveal Enoch's secret wisdom to the eschatological community. This may be why *2 Enoch* continued to be transmitted in these Christian circles. Of course, in other circles—those of Ethiopia—a different Enochic tradition would be maintained within the Christian Church: the difference is suggestive of potentially divergent reading strategies between the different circles. This thought shall be left undeveloped here, but it seems a worthy topic for future research.

Part 1. Eschatology in 2 Enoch

After a brief prologue, the book begins with the appearance to Enoch of two angels, who inform him that they are to take him to heaven. Enoch then calls his sons to himself and delivers a brief instruction (2:1–4) before the angels lift him up (3). Enoch subsequently ascends through the seven heavens (ch 4–20; the 8th–10th heavens found in the longer recension are probably not original),[45] seeing on the way aspects of the creation (4–6, 11–16), places of eschatological destiny (7–10) and the roles of some of the angels in relation to the creation (17–19). He is finally brought, in chapter 20, before the throne of the LORD, who describes to him how he—and he alone—made the world, including mankind. Enoch is then commissioned to write down all that he has seen (33) in books that will be preserved from damage in the Flood by Michael and revealed to an eschatological generation (35:2). After a further reference to his commissioning in 36, Enoch's face is cooled (37) in preparation for his return to earth to his sons. Chapters 39–42 summarise Enoch's visions before he begins, in the second half of 42, to instruct his children. This instructional material continues to 67, in which Enoch is taken away by the angels. Chapter 68 then begins the

[44] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 95.
[45] See Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 109–11.

description of a festival held by Enoch's sons, a festival in which Methuselah (69) offers sacrifices to the LORD.[46] Chapter 70 speaks of Noah's brother Nir, to whom Methuselah gives the vestments of the priesthood,[47] and who then takes up the sacrificial function of Methuselah. The account of Nir leads in, in chapter 71, to the account of the miraculous birth of Melchizedek, the son of Nir's wife, Sophonim. Melchizedek appears as a fully-developed child and is taken away to Eden, in order that he might be protected from the coming flood (72).[48] The book then ends with a doxology (73).[49]

The Centrality of Revelation

It is quite obvious that the theme of revelation is central to *2 Enoch*. As Enoch ascends through the seven heavens he *sees* aspects of creation and of heavenly and eschatological realities. The climax of his heavenly ascent is his arrival in the seventh heaven, where the LORD *reveals* to him the account of creation. In chapter 40, the uniqueness of Enoch's knowledge is stressed as he recounts his visions of the heavenly bodies:

> The angels themselves do not know even their numbers. But I, I have written down their names.[50]

This language, stressing the veracity and comprehensiveness of Enoch's knowledge, runs right through this chapter, but it is not an autonomous knowledge that Enoch claims. Rather it is the knowledge that has been revealed to him by God. Chapters 23, 33 and 36 are important here, describing the work of the angel Vereveil[51] in revealing the works of the LORD and then the process by which Enoch's knowledge is to be written down in book form. In numerous places, these books now take on eschatological significance: they will be preserved by Michael, Ariokh

---

[46] Most scholars would now regard the account as an original part of *2 Enoch*, rather than a redactional appendix. See Orlov, "Melchizedek Legend of *2 Enoch*", 25, for an overview of past scholarly opinion and for a summary of the evidence for the originality of the section.

[47] Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother: The Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," *Henoch* 22 (2000), 207–221, argues that this section is polemic in nature, although it is not clear who might be polemicised by such an account.

[48] The longer recension has obvious Christian interpolations in 71:32–37 and 72:6–7. See Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 118–125.

[49] The longer recension has a lengthy chronology in 73, but this is probably a later addition. See Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 125–128.

[50] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 165.

[51] There are several variant spellings of this name.

and Mariokh (33:11–12) until being revealed to "the last generation of many" (35:2).[52]

The Content of Revelation (1): Creation

There are two elements that dominate the content of the revelation received by Enoch: creation and eschatology. As he rises through the seven heavens, the first things that Enoch sees are the stellar orders (4:1) and the treasuries of the snow and cold (5:1–2) and dew (6:1). In both instances, the role of angels either regulating or protecting the elements is stressed, a narrative feature that, given the subordinate role of the angels stressed throughout the book (e.g. 33:7),[53] emphasises the sovereignty of the LORD over these elements. After his ascension, as he is brought before the LORD—an incident that contains several features intended to stress the uniqueness and holiness of the LORD[54]—Vereveil is appointed to instruct Enoch from the heavenly books.[55] The angel's discourse is clearly concerned with Creation, but with the emphasis falling on the LORD's sovereignty:

> He was telling me all the deeds of the LORD the earth and the sea and all the elements and the courses and the life. (23:1)[56]

After Vereveil's recounting, the LORD himself describes the construction of creation to Enoch. While the account involves mediate creation, through the role of the primal elements Adoil and Arukhas,[57] the stress continually falls on the sovereignty of the LORD over the whole construction; Adoil and Arukhas are clearly subordinate to God, and for

---

[52] The similarities with the eschatology of *4QInstruction* and *1 Enoch* hardly needs to be highlighted.

[53] Interestingly, the emphasis in chapter 8 on the sin of the Watchers is precisely that of a lack of submission to the will of God.

[54] Note the emphasis on the distance between Enoch and God (20:3, 21:2), and the references to the obeisance of heavenly armies (20:3). Before he can cross the distance to the LORD, there is a requirement for Enoch to be transformed by his anointing with "the delightful oil" into the likeness of the glorious ones. More shall be said on this below.

[55] It is possible that these heavenly books may correspond to the heavenly tablets/ Book of Hagu mentioned in our discussion of *4QInstruction*, though more evidence would be required to sustain the parallel.

[56] Andersen , "2 Enoch," 141. The account continues to describe aspects of nature before eventually climaxing in an reference to the Hebrew language and the "new song" of the heavenly army.

[57] For a discussion of these elements, see Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 164–167, and my own discussion below.

most of the account (24:2–30:7) the verbs are in the first person, as the Lord describes his work.

The clear emphasis is on the unique status of the Lord as Creator. This is, of course, a key element within Jewish monotheism of the Second Temple period.[58] Within *2 Enoch* it is *the* ethical foundation. At the culmination of the creation account, the Lord stresses his own uniqueness ("I created from the lowest foundation and up to the highest heaven and out to their end. There is no counsellor and no successor, only myself, eternal, not made by hands." 33:3–4) and then commands Enoch to deliver his books to his sons:

> They will read them and know their Creator. And they will understand that there is no Creator except myself. (33:8).[59]

The key function of Enoch's books, then, is to bring his sons to acknowledge the Lord as their Creator. This calls to mind Enoch's vision of the place of punishment in chapter 10; at the climax of the list of sins committed by those who are destined to inhabit this place is the fact that they,

> do not acknowledge their Creator, but bow down to vain gods, constructing images and bowing down to something made by hand. (10:6)[60]

It also forms a basis for another climactic reference, this time in a positive context. In 42:14, the climactic beatitude blesses the one who "understands all the works of the Lord and because of his works, knows the Creator."[61] Numerous other references reinforce the impression that an acknowledgement of the Lord's sole status as Creator is the foundation of right living (47:2–3; 48; 51:5; 52:5; 66:1–5; 70:6).

The Content of Revelation (2): Eschatology

I shall note, as the argument progresses, some of the more subtle ways in which this Creation theology informs particular ethical standards, in particular those that relate to human dignity. First, though, we must understand the eschatology of *2 Enoch* and particularly the role within that eschatology played by the Enochic revelation.

---

[58] See R. Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 1–22.

[59] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 157.

[60] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 121.

[61] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 169.

Chapter 34 speaks of the flood that will come upon the earth. This is followed, in chapter 35, by a reference to Noah as "a righteous man" delivered, together with his house, from this judgement. This message of hope turns dark, however, as a prediction is made that from the seed of that house a generation, "the last of many,"[62] will arise. This generation is portrayed as corrupt and rapacious, a theme consistent with the emphasis we noted in chapter two of the distinction between a remnant group and the parent group. At the end of that generation (35:2), the books of Enoch[63] will be revealed, an act clearly portrayed as salvific. There appears to be, therefore, a strong similarity with the eschatological ideas we have noted in previous chapters of the eschatological revealing of wisdom.

The shadow of judgement hangs over this last generation and plays an important role in the eschatology of the work. In his ascent through the heavens, Enoch sees the place of judgement of the godless (10:1–6), a place that fills him with horror. As the LORD commissions Enoch in 36:3, an explicit part of his function is to bear witness to that judgement. And as he returns to his sons and recounts his journey, he speaks of his glimpse of hell (40:12–13) and of how he wept over the impious (41:1). 42:2 contains the solemn words of Enoch to the guards of the keys of hell:

> Would to heaven that I had not seen you, nor heard about your activities, nor that any member of my tribe had been brought to you.[64]

The counter-side of this judgement, however, is the description of Paradise in 8:1–9:1 and 42:3, a description which underlies the beatitudes of chapters 42 and 52. When the two elements of paradise and hell are understood together, particularly when they are related to the beatitudes and imprecations of 42 and 52, we discover an emphasis on eschatological reversal that is comparable to that noted in relation to *4QInstruction* and *1 Enoch*.

It is of some importance that in his visions of the places of judgement, Enoch discovers the kind of behaviour that leads to one or other of the places of eschatological destination. Ethical elements that arise in this context resurface often throughout the course of the paraenetic material.

---

[62] Note Andersen's footnote to this verse, and in particular the reference to Qumran, "2 Enoch," 158.

[63] It is specified that the books are those in Enoch's handwriting.

[64] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 167–9.

The closeness of the interweaving of the two aspects of Enochic revelation discussed above, creation and eschatology, is only fully appreciated when we begin to consider the ethics found throughout the book. Such a consideration will demonstrate that *2 Enoch* presents a similar idea to *4QInstruction*, namely that the eschatological revelation of Enoch enables the remnant community to fulfil their creation mandate. The Enochic community—if we can speak of such a group—live in accordance with their Creator's will, renewing the lifestyle that human sinfulness has rejected. The ethics of this eschatological group are, as a result, comprehensive.

Part 2. Form and Ethics in 2 Enoch

At the end of the LORD's account of creation, as we have already noted, Enoch is told that his writings will show his sons that there is no Creator but God (33:8–9). This is followed by a reference to the Flood (33:12) which is explained in chapter 34:

> I know the wickedness of mankind, how they will not carry the yoke I have placed on them. Nor do they sow the seed which I have given them; but they have renounced my yoke, and they will take on another yoke; and they will sow worthless seed and do obeisance to vain gods. And they will reject my sole rule.[65]

This passage depicts the rejection of the LORD's sole status as Creator and of his sole rule as the refusal to carry his yoke. It is interesting to note in passing that the people who have rejected the yoke are not depicted as being free; rather, they are simply bound in servitude to other gods, whose yoke they carry instead. In chapter 48, Enoch addresses his sons, presenting them with his books, which are to be delivered to all "who have the wisdom and who will fear the LORD, and they will accept them" (48:7). The following verse then establishes a contrast based around the concept of the yoke. On one hand, the undiscerning, who "do not understand the LORD, will not accept them," the reason being that "their yoke will weigh them down." But on the other hand, the Enochic books are themselves depicted as a yoke:

[65] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 159.

> Happy is he who bears their yoke and grasps it; for he will find it on the day of the great judgement.[66]

The inference is clearly that through the Enochic books, there is a new opportunity to place oneself under God's true yoke, a yoke cast off by humanity in primeval times and that brings eschatological blessing rather than simply weighing one down.

This point is confirmed by many of the specific ethical exhortations. The salient point that we should notice is that specific requirements of behaviour are often founded upon the fact that the LORD is the Creator and that man is his image-bearer. There is, therefore, a sense that Enoch's paraenetic material is actually calling readers back to the ethics of the Creation itself, the ethical dimension of the created order.

A first example of this is found in 42:14. At the end of the long series of beatitudes found in this chapter, the following words are found:

> Happy is he who understands all the works of the LORD and, because of his works, knows the Creator.[67]

Coming at the conclusion of the series, this beatitude carries a great deal of force. As far as our argument is concerned, the point of note is that the eschatological blessing which is surely expressed in the form (and note, at this point, that the beatitudes are juxtaposed with the description of Paradise in 42:3), is pronounced upon those who acknowledge the specific truth rejected by their forefathers, namely the status of the LORD as sole Creator.

A more subtle example is found in 44:1–4. Here, the status of human beings as image bearers of God[68] forms a basis for both the prohibition of showing contempt to another human and the positive exhortation to show compassion to the "condemned"[69] and the needy. To insult or profane the image of the LORD is to insult or profane the LORD's own face.

---

[66] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 177. There are variants in the reading of the second half of this verse. Some read "He will plough"; others read, "He will find it." As Andersen notes (p. 176) neither seems to make much sense. It is, however, immaterial to the argument advanced here.

[67] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 169.

[68] The Slavonic here is *v podobii lice svoevo*: "In the image/facsimile of his face."

[69] There is a good deal of material about persecution and condemnation in *2 Enoch*. If the widely held view is correct, that the book originated in Alexandria during the Roman period then the presence of this material is hardly surprising. For a description of the persecutions of the Jews during this period, see Joseph M. Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to the Emperor Hadrian* (trans. Robert Cornman; New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997), 161–205.

The logic is grounded in Creation; the ethic, therefore, is a reclaiming of a standard inherent to the Creation but rejected by sinners. The command finds a kind of echo in chapter 63, which takes up the alms idea but stresses the necessity of making such gifts gladly: if the heart is grumbling or contemptuous then the offering is meaningless. This would seem to stress the need for some kind of inner transformation of the attitude rather than just an outward conformity to a law.

A third example is found in chapter 58, but echoes of it are heard in other parts of the book. 58:1–4 speak of the naming of the animals by Adam and of the placing of those animals under humanity's rule. Verses 5–6 then speak of the accusations that the animals will bring against humanity for any mistreatment.[70] This then forms the basis for the discussion in chapter 59 of the correct practice to be followed in making an animal sacrifice or in slaughtering an animal for meat, a practice also referred to in 69:12; given the fact that the discussion in chapter 59 follows on from 58:5–6, it seems that the practice of tying the four legs reflects a desire to minimise the suffering of sacrificed animals. Again, therefore, an aspect of the Creation account has become a basis for a particular ethical standard to be operative among those who have been saved by Enoch's revelation.

Even those ethical elements that appear to be founded on the future reality of the coming judgement are in actual fact based upon a true appreciation of the created order, insofar as the judgement is presented not as a corrective response to human sin, but as a part of the created order itself. Two passages in particular demonstrate that this is the case: chapters 25–26 and chapter 65.

In chapter 25 we find the following account:

> And I commanded the lowest things: "Let one of the invisible things come out visibly!" And Adoil descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great age. And I said to him, "Disintegrate yourself, Adoil, and let what is disintegrated from you become visible." And he disintegrated himself and there came out from him the great age. And thus it carried all the creation which I had wished to create. (25:1–3)[71]

---

[70] For possible Iranian connections of this kind of thinking, see S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968* (ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and C.J. Bleeker; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 76–77.

[71] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 145.

This is followed by a description of the solidifying of light into the foundation for the "highest things," a description which in turn is followed by this account:

> And I called out a second time into the lowest things and I said, "Let one of the invisible things come out solid and visible." There came out Arukhas, solid and heavy and very black. And I saw how suitable he was. And I said to him, "Come down low and become solid! And become the foundation of the lowest things!" (26:1–3)[72]

This section of *2 Enoch* is fraught with tensions and problems, but several points are clear. First, all of creation and time are seen as being brought from the substance of Adoil, which/who "carried all the creation which I had wished to create." Böttrich rightly notes the distinction between Adoil and Arukhas at this point. Where the former carries all creation (*vsę tvarĭ*), the latter is the foundation only for the lowest things (*dolnimĭ*).[73] This distinction becomes clearer when it is appreciated that the description of Arukhas is in parallel not with that of Adoil, but with that of the light: both are presented as foundations, one for the highest and one for the lowest things.[74] Creation is therefore depicted as a reality within the parent sphere/reality of Adoil. If Vaillant and Böttrich are right in seeing the etymology of Adoil as being derived from עדו ("eternity" plus the 3 m.s. suffix, hence: "his eternity")[75] and the suffix "-el," then the idea is of an eternal reality within which the temporal reality exists. Even if this etymology is regarded as unconvincing, it is still the case that creation is depicted as taking place within some kind of parent reality. The importance of this will become clear presently. Second, the stress that Arukhas is the foundation of the lowest things, below which there is nothing, causes the reader to conceptualise the reference

---

[72] Ibid., 145.

[73] See Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 164–165.

[74] Böttrich's otherwise good analysis is weak at this point. He follows the reading *vŭcprĭnix* ("highest") found only in R rather than the better attested *prĕspodnix* ("lowest") found in all the other mss. The basis for his argument is that of the symmetry of "highest" (25:1) with "lowest" (26:1) (see ftnote 82, page 164). This, however, loses the real symmetry of the light and Arukhas as foundations.

[75] See Vaillant, 1952, xi, Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 166. Other suggestions are: Charles/Morfill *APOT* (1896): יד אל ("hand of God,"); A. Loisy, "Un nouveau Livre d'Henoch," *RHLR* 1 (1896), 42: האור ("the light"); L. Gry, "Quelques noms d'anges et d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940), 200–203; G. Scholem, *Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962) regarded the term as a corruption of "Sadoqil" ("Gerechter") and Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 113, regarded the term as a combination of "Hades" and the suffix "el."

to Hell in 40:12–13[76] as being within the created order.[77] Thus, there is an emphasis that the aspect of judgement is built-in to the created order, rather than simply being a reaction of God to sin.

Chapter 65 develops this idea. The passage is linked to 25 by its use of the term "the great age,"[78] and the idea of the "age of creation" (65:1), established by the LORD as a precursor to the actual work of creation and originating in Adoil. The age is then divided by the LORD into times,[79] but we read in 65:6–8 that,

> When the whole of creation which the LORD has created shall come to an end, and when each person shall go to the LORD's great judgement, then the time periods will perish, and there will be neither years nor months nor days, and hours will no longer be counted;
>
> But they will constitute a single age. And all the righteous, who escape from the great judgement, will be collected together with the great age. And the age, at the same time will unite with the righteous and they will be eternal.[80]

The passage seems to primarily be intended to demonstrate that as the righteous are united to the great age (by what means this union takes place is not clarified), they become eternal. The following verses describe the peace and safety of that eternal existence in terms that echo chapter 9. When brought together with chapters 25–26, where the great age is first mentioned as being in the belly of Adoil, we have a clear indication that "eternity," including both the judgement and paradise, are part of the created order.

The importance of this is the fact that to properly acknowledge the LORD as Creator involves taking eternity into account. Thus, ethical elements that do not obviously arise from the Creation account may still

---

[76] The long manuscripts contain a merism: Enoch recounts what he has seen from the height of the seventh heaven to the depth of the lowest hell. This may be a later Christian interpolation, but even the shorter account emphasises "descent."

[77] It is not clear how we should relate this to the earlier vision of the place of imprisonment being in the heavens (10:1–4). Perhaps the two references are not intended to be compared. Whatever the answer to this problem is, we may still note the fact that the various levels of the heavens are also understood as part of the created order, at least until we encounter the throne of the LORD in the seventh heaven, which is depicted in this chapter as being above the solidified light. We should note, in this regard, that the place of punishment described in chapter 10 has been "prepared" (*ugotovano*) for the sinners.

[78] 25:3; 65:8 "Age" is *věka*, which Pines (77–78) prefers to translate as "Aion."

[79] Longer mss. specify the division as being into years, months days and hours. This material has been transplanted into 43:1 in the shorter mss. See Andersen, "2 Enoch," 171.

[80] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 193.

be seen as part of a Creation-theology that incorporates the places of eternal reward.[81]

This eschatological dimension, factored into the Creation account, can be seen to underlie much of the remaining ethical material. In 42:6–14, the eschatological element is implied by the formula "Happy is he . . ."[82] juxtaposed with the description of Paradise (42:3). Eternal happiness is what is in view here. Some of the ethical elements that might not naturally or intuitively arise from the Creation account, such as caring for the poor (verse 8) and those treated unjustly (9) now become actions that are important to observe because of their eternal consequences.[83] Similarly, in chapters 49–51 a description of the judgement and of Enoch's writing down of every person's sins[84] gives way to an ethical exhortation that constantly refers back to the judgement account. Again, the elements do not intuitively arise from the Creation account, but are based upon the doctrine of the judgement. Thus, non-retaliation is encouraged (50:4) on the basis that it is the LORD who repays[85] and who will be "an avenger" on the day of the great judgement. A willingness to "lose gold and silver for the sake of your brother" is also encouraged, on the basis that it will be rewarded with eternal treasure on the day of judgement (50:5), so that wealth and status in this life must be subordinated to such realities in the age to come. Finally, although it is not clear what is being spoken of in the reference to the unfastening of the burdensome yoke (51:3),[86] the action is justified by the idea of the reward on the day of judgement.

We may also note the way in which Creation and Judgement mutually endorse particular behaviour. Chapter 58, as we have seen already, speaks of the Creation account, referring to the naming of the animals by Adam and his appointment as their superior. This becomes part of

---

[81] The point is reinforced by Enoch's recounting of his journey: after describing his knowledge of creation in 40, Enoch describes his viewing of Hell (40:12–42:2) and of Paradise (42:3). The effect is to cause us to regard the eschatological and creation elements of Enoch's journey as a single unified whole.

[82] *Blaženĭ iže*.

[83] We could expand this observation to take chapter 52 into account also.

[84] It is interesting to note the tension of the determinism in Enoch's visionary knowledge of each person's sins with the emphasis on the responsibility of the reader to mend their ways.

[85] The tradition is similar to that found in Rom 12:19–21 and Heb 10:30.

[86] The reference seems to have confused the various scribes. It remains only in a rather mangled form. See Andersen, "2 Enoch," 178–9.

the basis for the condemnation of animal cruelty; the other part of the basis is provided by a reference to the judgement (58:6).

The reader, then, is driven to the conclusion that the lifestyle that God expects of those who have been saved through the Enochic writings is one that is in proper alignment with his intention at Creation, restoring the appropriate creaturely behaviour rather than being some new innovation or *Interimethik*. Importantly, though, knowing one's true place within Creation involves taking into account the age that is to come, which is an essential and inescapable aspect of the created order.[87]

A Dialogue with Convention

A closer look at some of the ethical material in *2 Enoch* shows that its "creation-eschatology," if we can call it that, allows it to dialogue with and challenge aspects of traditional Jewish wisdom, characterised by the "act-consequence connection," without necessarily rejecting that wisdom as a whole. The pivotal point of this dialogue in *2 Enoch* is the issue of status.

The most explicit example of such dialogue is in chapter 43. Enoch recounts his observations of the seasons and times and years, highlighting that he has observed the "differences" within these. This leads him on to speak of the differences between people: one is "better" or "more honourable"[88] than another because of his possession of one of the following: property, wisdom, intelligence, guile, silence of the lips, purity, strength, comeliness, youth, a penetrating mind, bodily appearance, abundant feelings.[89] The list is arranged stylistically:

> One because of much property,
> Another because of wisdom of the heart,
> Another . . . *et cetera*.[90]

Such a stylistic arrangement conveys the sense of a school setting, of material arranged into a poetic block, similar to the kind of arrangement

---

[87] Böttrich (*Weltweisheit*, 184–9) notes the connections between the ethical material in *2 Enoch* and later Jewish ideas of Noachic law. His point is valid, and I agree with his understanding that *2 Enoch* is presenting an ethic applicable to all of humanity. However, I think construing the worldview of *2 Enoch* and the related ethical standards in the way I have done here—that is, related to Creation—takes us closer to the core thought of the book, and perhaps of the kind of Judaism that may underlie it.

[88] The latter rendering is in J and brings out the status issue implied in all the mss.

[89] Only the first five of these are found in the shorter recension, but Andersen argues that the full list is the original one. "2 Enoch," 170.

[90] See Andersen, "2 Enoch," 170–1.

seen at points in Ecclesiastes.[91] The reader is drawn into thinking that Enoch is endorsing such a view, but there is a sting in the tail:

> But there is no-one better than he who fears the LORD; for those who fear the LORD will be glorious forever.[92]

Interestingly, the longer manuscripts preface this statement by saying that "Even though these sayings are heard on every side, nevertheless there is no-one better…"[93] The thought, then, is clearly that the status issues that were such a part of the readers' society, that were found in that society's wisdom literature, require to be re-thought on the basis of the more holistic view of creation that Enoch now has, including as it does the idea of the great age to come. Interestingly, this discussion of status leads on to a passage (44:1–5) that speaks of the right treatment of one's fellow man. The passage stresses the dignity of all men as image bearers of God (44:1–3), then lauds the one who shows compassion to those of low status (the condemned, the broken and the needy) before culminating in another reference to the judgement (44:5). Such concern to show compassion to the poor is widely seen in Jewish texts, even elitist ones, such as Sirach (see Sir 10:19–31), but here it flows from a consideration of the status of *all* who are made in God's image, and from the universal requirement to fear the LORD. Status issues must be rethought and actions towards the poor changed accordingly.

Having noticed this, we may now notice a further point that seems to have been missed by commentators on *2 Enoch*. Before his departure on the heavenly journey, Enoch instructs his sons (2:1–2). The instruction reveals Enoch's own personal piety and his desire that his sons would also walk properly with God. It is striking, though, that the exhortations are of a fairly conventional sort: Enoch's sons are to walk before the LORD, to keep his judgements, to be generous in their gifts to God and to bless the LORD with their firstborn. In reward for their obedience, the LORD will bless them and fill their storehouses and "will not diminish the work of your hands." There is nothing here of the more radical ethical demands concerning caring for the poor, embracing poverty, non-retaliation and so on. Neither is there any real suggestion of receiving

---

[91] This parallel is a fruitful one, given that many have seen Ecclesiastes as also engaged in a dialogue with conventional wisdom, citing accepted blocks of teaching before challenging aspects of their thought. See Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 55.

[92] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 171.

[93] Ibid., 170.

blessing in an age to come: the kind of divine rewards spoken of are this-worldly.

Enoch's pre-ascension exhortations are, therefore, rather different to his post-ascension ones. The content of his heavenly revelation has informed and remoulded his ethical convictions. There is not, however, any clear indication that there was anything actually *wrong* with Enoch's pre-ascension standards—he was, after all, the "wise man" whom the LORD took away—simply that they needed to be augmented. Similarly, the sayings in chapter 43 are not condemned as wrong; rather, the status issues that they are concerned with must be placed within a bigger context that includes the age to come and the status that the faithful will enjoy there. While in dialogue with the kind of conventional wisdom found in a book like Proverbs, then, the material does not appear to be in open hostility to that wisdom.

The Recovered Glory of Adam in 2 Enoch

Thus far, our examination of *2 Enoch* has highlighted the relationship between Creation and the ethical behaviour expected of the remnant to whom Enoch's writings have been revealed. Another possible link with Creation must be discussed, however, for a number of scholars have seen the transformation of Enoch in chapter 22 as representing the recovery of the lost glory of Adam.

Such a view has been expressed by Moshe Idel,[94] who suggests that the transformation of Enoch represents a recovery of the lost divine luminosity of Adam. The garments of light with which Enoch is clothed are understood to represent those lost by Adam when he sinned. Idel's article is concerned primarily with rabbinic sources and with the *hekalot* literature, but *2 Enoch* 22 is nonetheless mentioned as reflecting this idea. In comparing the bestowal of glorious clothes upon the patriarch in 3 Enoch 12 with the chapter just mentioned, Idel comments,

> To the best of my knowledge, Enoch is the only living person for whom we learn that luminous garments, reminiscent of Adam's lost garments of light, were made.[95]

Idel's article is helpful in highlighting the range of ways in which Adamic glory is referred to in Jewish sources; we might note the broad connections

[94] Moshe Idel, "Enoch is Metatron." *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990), 220–240.
[95] Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," 224.

between his case and the cluster of ideas isolated in the Dead Sea scrolls and Syriac literature by Alexander Golitzin.[96]

Philip Alexander's treatment of this passage also sees this connection, although only when *2 Enoch* 22 is seen as part of a tradition linked to the transformation of Enoch in 3 Enoch and later in the Zohar. He comments,

> …behind these passages is a concept of Metatron as a divine entity first incarnate in Adam and then reincarnate in Enoch. Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam, who sinned and fell, reascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels…Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure—a second Adam through whom humanity is restored.[97]

In the part of his study specifically concerned with the transformation of the patriarch in *2 Enoch*, Alexander makes a crucial contribution by highlighting the theological pressure behind such an understanding:

> The assertion that a human could bodily enter the upper world was profoundly problematic within the worldview of early Judaism…The problem was more than practical: it was deeply theological. Heaven was the realm of God and God's angels; earth belonged to humankind. It was not easy to admit that the boundary between these two worlds could be crossed, since this implied some form of ontological transformation which blurred the distinction between human and divine: descent from heaven involved "incarnation," ascent from earth "deification."[98]

Interestingly, Alexander also notes the difference between *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch* in this regard: the former treats with great caution Enoch's ascent to heaven, maintaining the proper boundaries between the realms of earth and heaven, while the latter stresses the "bodily" character of Enoch's ascension and the need for transformation into an angelic figure.

While both of these works assume *2 Enoch* 22 to be Jewish, the suggestions seem plausible, particularly when the presence of similar motifs in

---

[96] Alexander Golitzin, "Recovering the 'Glory of Adam': 'Divine Light' Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls Present and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*, edited by James R. Davila, (STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 275–308. This idea, and this article, have been discussed in chapter 3 of the present study.

[97] P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 111.

[98] Alexander, "From Son of Man to Second God," 102.

Christian writings of Semitic provenance—those studied by Golitzin—is noted. As the discussion below will make clear, however, the idea that it is specifically by his recovery of Adamic glory that Enoch functions as a redeemer figure is, in my view, not at work in *2 Enoch*.

This latter view has been developed particularly by Andrei Orlov, who has built on the work of Idel and Alexander and proposed a more thoroughgoing relationship between *2 Enoch* and the Adamic traditions, proposing a number of ways in which the text of *2 Enoch* seems to portray elements of Adam's pre-lapsarian glory as having been transferred to Enoch.[99]

Orlov begins by arguing that Adamic elements are attested in both recensions of the text and appear to go back to the core of the work, rather than being the result of later expansion. The texts he cites as evidence for this are 30:8–32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1–3; 71:28. Unfortunately, of this list, only 41:1 and 58:1–3 are well attested in the shorter recension, and neither of these references suggests any kind of elevated status for Adam (this will be an important part of Orlov's argument), except in his role as steward of creation (in 58:1–3). 41:1, in fact, refers to humanity in a generic sense as being made in the image of God; the Adamic reference is found only in the title, witnessed to by the longer recension. This does not mean that we should assume that Orlov is incorrect in seeing Adamic traditions as occupying a major part of the core tradition—it is possible that later transmission omitted some of this material—but it does mean that we should approach his case with caution.

Orlov then cites the works mentioned above, by Idel and Alexander, in order to support his claim that the transformation of Enoch in chapter 22 represents the restoration of Adamic glory, although he also sees the story of Moses as providing background to the transformation account.[100] With this point in place, Orlov proceeds to describe in more detail the ways in which Adam's pre-lapsarian condition informs a range of descriptions of Enoch and his functions. For the most part, his work is based on alleged parallels with the Adam and Eve literature.[101]

---

[99] The most important article is Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *JSJ* 34 (2003), 274–303. It is this article that I interact with here, although since I first wrote this chapter, the material has also been published in his book, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, (TSAJ 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

[100] Andrei Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *SBLSP 39* (2000): 130–147.

[101] The problems regarding the provenance and date of the primary Adam and Eve books are well discussed by Michael Stone, *The History of the Adam and Eve Literature* (SBLEJL 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 42–74.

He begins by noting the reference to Adam as "king of all the earth" in 30:12 and the depiction of man as "lord over [God's] possessions" in 58:3; this is then related to the reference to Enoch as a king (39:8) and his depiction as the manager of the earth (43:1). Three problems should be noted in Orlov's argumentation. First, the reference to Adam as king is only found in the longer recension, and is not necessarily a core part of the tradition. Second, the reference to man/Adam as lord of God's possessions serves an important ethical function in 58:3, providing the basis for the animal welfare and sacrifice commands that immediately follow it. This would seem to provide a more significant *contextual* explanation for the occurrence of the phrase than does Orlov's *intertextual* one. Third, the possible reference to Enoch as king in 39:8 is intended primarily as a point of comparison with the King of kings (God):

> Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of an earthly king… how much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is to stand before the face of the king of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies.[102]

Again, this would seem to provide a contextual explanation of the text that leaves Orlov's suggestion possible but not necessary.

Orlov then examines the idea of angelic veneration, drawing on Michael Stone's argument that the angelic veneration of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22:7 seems to deliberately contrast with the refusal of the angels to venerate Adam in the Armenian, Georgian and Latin versions of The Life of Adam and Eve.[103] The case here is stronger and Orlov presents detailed parallels between the two accounts. Nevertheless, as I have suggested above and as I have already noted Alexander as suggesting, the scene seems primarily intended to reinforce the unique status of God and the transformation required to exist within the heavenly realm. Again, such contextual considerations should be taken into account before intertextual possibilities are explored. On this level, it should be noted that while the angels are depicted as doing obeisance, it is not clear that this is intended as veneration of Enoch: the term is left unqualified and the veneration may be of God, again reinforcing his uniqueness.

The third area examined by Orlov is the use of the title "Youth" to address Enoch at several points of the text, at least as witnessed to by

---

[102] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 164.

[103] M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*" *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–156.

certain manuscripts. This title has links with the name Metatron, which occurs in 3 Enoch (see especially 3 Enoch 3:2). The originality of the title has been strongly argued for by Andersen, despite the fact that it is attested only in certain manuscripts.[104] The connections between the title and the Adamic tradition are indirect, however: Orlov argues that the title occurs in contexts of angelic veneration and therefore links it to the area just studied above, from which he argues for a link with the Adamic traditions, in which Satan refuses to bow to Adam because of his inferior age.[105] Such a link may be called into question by James R. Davila's study of the Youth traditions.[106] Davila suggests that the Youth traditions belong to a late stratum within 3 Enoch and that if there are connections with the Adam traditions "these have been imported secondarily along with the identification of Enoch with the Youth."[107]

The following section, in which Orlov discusses the inappropriateness of earthly food for beings who have come from the celestial realm (see *2 Enoch* 56:2, Life of Adam and Eve 4:2), is interesting, but again it must be asked whether Orlov has properly explored contextual factors in assessing the imagery. The stress here seems again to be on the radical transformation of Enoch that was required for him to exist in the presence of God, since the reference is specifically linked to his transformation when anointed with heavenly oil (*2 Enoch* 22). This may well reflect the idea of lost Adamic glory (or, to be more precise, the need for its recovery if one is to exist in the heavenly realm) that has been observed in other texts, but the very specific links that Orlov sees with The Life of Adam and Eve 4:2 seem to overplay this link.

His examination of the divine face motif is also problematic. He notes the connection between Enoch's transformation in chapter 22 and his vision of God's face. The association he sees between this and 44:1, in which man is made in the likeness of God's own face may perhaps neglect the ethical function of the latter reference (again outlined above); it certainly neglects the fact that the specific reference to God's "face" in chapter 22:5–6 basically reflects the standard way to denote

---

[104] Andersen, "2 Enoch" 118–19.

[105] See Gary A. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," in *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*, (ed. by G. Anderson, M.E. Stone and J. Tromp; SVTP 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 83–110.

[106] Davila, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth' and Jesus," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 248–274.

[107] Ibid., 266–267. The statement is made in the context of a footnote discussing Gary A. Anderson's article cited above.

the idea of being "in front of" something in *2 Enoch* and doesn't necessarily indicate an actual face.[108] The discussion of the oil that transforms Enoch in chapter 22 is stronger, noting several plausible links with the Adam and Eve traditions, but here Orlov himself is cautious to suggest a definite link.

The final area studied by Orlov is the reference to Enoch as the one "who carries/has carried away the sins of mankind." Orlov argues that the reference to the carrying away of sins refers to the removal of the sin of Adam, the protoplast, before the Flood, connecting this to his schema of anti-Adamic polemics. His case, however, rests to a large extent on the use of resultative participles for the verbs meaning "carried away"[109] and of a generic reference to humanity in J, P and R (hence: "the one who has carried away the sins of mankind"). The manuscript witnesses vary at this point, however, and the generic reference to all mankind is not universally attested, with A reading "our sins." This last variant is paralleled by the statement that Enoch is "the one who reveals,"[110] an emphasis that seems in keeping with the stress of the rest of the book that Enoch's salvific role is fundamentally that of a revealer, and it is his revelation that deals with the problem of sin, carrying it away. Furthermore, the use of the resultative participles cannot be pushed into referring solely, or even primarily, to the ways in which Enoch has recovered Adam's glory, as Orlov argues: it could be connected to any aspect of his work, including his reception and transmission of revelation, which seems more in keeping with the narrative of the work as a whole.

To conclude this discussion: the view that Enoch's transformation represents a recovery of the glorious robes of Adam, as expressed above by Alexander, seems at least plausible, but Orlov's suggestion of thoroughgoing Adamic intertextuality, while interesting, is not, in the end, convincing. Crucially, it tends to neglect more obvious functions for some of the hypothetical Adamic allusions. Moreover, there is nothing in *2 Enoch* that is comparable to the material found in 1QS 3&4, where it is the elect remnant in which Adam's glory is recovered. While it would probably be helpful to my thesis if Orlov were to be correct, I cannot agree that the recovered glory of Adam is as crucial and pervasive a feature of *2 Enoch* as he suggests.

---

[108] The Slavonic phrases *prěd licemŭ* ("before the face of . . .") or *v/na licemŭ* ("in/to the face of") are used consistently throughout the work to denote the spatial relationship of being in front of something. It may reflect the use of such language in LXX.

[109] *ōtjatelja/ōtimitelĕ* occur variously.

[110] Regarded by Andersen as original, "2 Enoch," 191.

Form and Ethics

It remains for us only to draw together some of the threads above regarding the use of forms in ethical exhortation and their relation to the broader worldview of the work. Simple admonitions are found in their densest concentration in the pre-ascension instruction in 2:2, where seven occur. They also occur in 47:1 ("Place the thought in your hearts and give heed to the sayings of your father . . . and receive these books") and in 50:2–51:3, where six occur, all eschatologically oriented. Two also occur in chapter 53 ("keep your hearts from every injustice in the balance,"[111] and "pay close attention to your fathers sayings"), one occurs in 54 ("the books I have given to you . . . do not mark them") and two occur in 61 ("keep your hearts from every unrighteous deed," and "that which a person makes request from the LORD for his own soul, in the same manner let him behave toward every living soul." Finally, a series of three admonitions is found in chapter 66 ("guard your souls from every kind of injustice," "walk in front of the face of the LORD," and "bring every oblation in front of the face of the LORD").

The most obvious difference between the admonitions in chapter 2 and all the others is the presence in the latter group of eschatological "for" clauses. Only chapter 53 lacks such clauses, but even here the description of the function of Enoch's cataloguing of each person's sins takes the place of such a clause. The feature serves to emphasise the importance of the judgement to the paraenetic context and, in particular, highlights the effect on Enoch's ethical outlook of the eschatological visions.

In addition to the admonitions are found beatitudes and curses (42 and 52, 44:4; 48:9; 62:1; 65:11), about which we have already said enough to warrant the statement that they are, in *2 Enoch*, essentially eschatological forms. We should also note the fact that, in the case of the solitary beatitudes in 44:4, 48:9, 62:1 and 65:11, the form operates as the culmination of a preceding discourse, so that the ethical standards are given an ideological basis. (In the case of 62:1, the form also leads in to a further discussion.) In 48:9, that preceding discourse is a string of rhetorical questions speaking of God's unique sovereignty over nature and is reminiscent of Isaiah 40:12–14 and Job 38–41.

---

[111] Formally, there may be another admonition here—"inherit the light"—but this is not a certain reading, and in any case seems to be operating as a reward in symmetry with the first admonition.

The remaining material consists of indicatives, sometimes taking the form of act-consequence statements (45:1–2; 59:1–60:4; 61:4; 63:1–4) and sometimes the form of discourses (58:1–6; 65:1–11). Where discourses occur, the ethical requirements arising from them are indicated by a more explicit form: the discourse in 58 gives way to the act-consequence language of 59; the discourse of 65:1–11 gives way to a beatitude that itself gives way to the admonitory material of 66.

What points arise from this examination of form and ethics? Most obvious is the fact that forms generally associated with the wisdom tradition have again been appropriated by an apocalyptic text, this time in order to teach a body of ethics that is inseparable from its ideological context. The closeness of the connection between the ethics and the content of Enoch's visions is difficult to overstate. In addition, however, it is striking that the arrangement of the various forms into stylised blocks of teaching reinforces the impression that this is the work of a great wise man, one truly worthy of the name sage. Again, therefore, it is not simply the case that the ethical standards are tied to the underlying narrative, but the ways in which they are presented are also tied to that narrative: Enoch is the great recipient and revealer of wisdom and the forms he uses reflect this. As such, the presence of lists of beatitudes, of discourses, of fatherly admonitions—all arranged stylistically—comes as no surprise to the reader.

Transmission and Tension

Given what has been observed of the eschatological character of *2 Enoch*, the significance of the work in its transmission contexts may now be explored further. As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, *2 Enoch* has undoubtedly been transmitted, if not authored, in Christian contexts. But this raises an obvious problem: we might expect a Christian author or tradent to feel uncomfortable with the centrality of Enoch to the eschatological scenario. Yet while there are obvious and unsubtle attempts to relate Melchizedek to Christ in the closing chapters (71:34 and possibly 72:7), there is no attempt to Christianise Enoch himself, nor to relate the eschatological community to Christianity. It is possible that the material was understood in this way, with Enoch simply being a forerunner of Jesus and his wisdom being part of what the latter had made known to Christians (perhaps this would be related to the idea of the "mystery," kept hidden and then revealed in the gospel, that is found in so much of Paul's writing). The similarity of Enoch's teaching with

that seen in Matthew (discussed above) would reinforce this as a possibility, but there is nothing in the text to clearly indicate that this was so.

This is almost as significant if the text was simply transmitted by Christians as it would be if the text was authored by Christians, for these eschatological ideas lie on the surface of the work as much as they lie at its core; they are inescapably essential to *2 Enoch* and the fact that this book was transmitted actively, being altered by its tradents, suggests that it was not copied unthinkingly but that these ideas would have been considered and processed by readers. This surely highlights the ability of Christians to accommodate material that was at once similar to (by emphasising the inaugural nature of eschatology and the role played within it by the possession of wisdom) and distinct from (by depicting Enoch as the principal revealer) their own core beliefs. This would seem to offer support for Davila's broad argument that Christians didn't feel any great pressure to "Christianise" stories set in the Old Testament period.[112]

It may be tempting at this point to suggest that this tension renders unthinkable a Christian authorship for *2 Enoch*, but given the importance of Enochic traditions within Judaism, I am more inclined to think that the possibility remains for *2 Enoch* to be a Christian composition, appropriating the general notion of Enoch as eschatological revealer and reconfiguring it in a way that more naturally allows it to be related to Jesus. Until further research has cast fresh light on *2 Enoch* the problem of origins cannot be resolved.

Conclusions

The narrative logic of *2 Enoch* is clearly that the eschatological community receiving the work have been given a revelation that allows them to live in proper accordance with the will of the Creator God, a will that is part of the very design plan of the world. The coming age is not simply presented as a corrective to this present aberrant one, but is part of that great design plan, so that living with an awareness of the transitory nature of this life—its wealth, pleasures and status—is a core part of living in proper alignment with the creation mandate. The connections between Enoch's wisdom and the ethics of the text are reflected also by the use of stylistically arranged forms, which reinforce the sense that Enoch is a figure of wisdom.

---

[112] See, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, 74–119.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the preceding study, we can now begin to draw some important conclusions into a coherent form and apply them to some of the issues mentioned in chapter 1, as well as to some of the issues current in research into Judaism.

1. *Generic Compatibility and Underlying Eschatological Concepts in* 1 Enoch *and* 4QInstruction

The research of John Collins, on "generic compatibility," suggests that the underlying concepts of a given text may explain the presence of sapiential and apocalyptic elements within that text. This, indeed, proves to be the case with *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*. These texts are marked by an inaugurated eschatology, within which the revealing of wisdom to an elect group—set apart from unfaithful Israel—plays a key role. On a formal level, this narrative stress on an essentially apocalyptic (revelatory) idea of "wisdom" facilitates the uptake of ideas and forms from the sapiential tradition (also concerned with "wisdom") and their fusion with forms and language more appropriate to a prophetic/apocalyptic context. Thus, the formal distinctions of wisdom and apocalyptic begin to dissolve or blur as a consequence of the governing idea of revealed wisdom.

The idea that creation will be restored as part of the eschatological scenario also characterises both texts. In *4QInstruction*, however, this seems to have become fused with the idea of revealed wisdom, which enables the elect to fulfil the design plan of creation in a way that those outside their community are unable to emulate. Thus, the restoration of creation patterns is a realised—not just a future—aspect of the eschatology of *4QInstruction*.

As an example of an *instruction* influenced by this confluence of traditions, *4QInstruction* also bears witness to a lack of concern for tight topical or formal arrangement of material. Moreover, within its loosely-arranged material, the stress may fall variously upon realised or future aspects of its inaugurated eschatology, in a way that could be mistaken

for careless redaction of strata by a scholarship insensitive to the subtleties of its eschatology.

These conclusions regarding eschatology and generic/formal issues may well be important to the study of Second Temple Judaism. They certainly provide some interesting lines of enquiry to bring to other texts of this period, particularly those combining sapiential and apocalyptic elements. Perhaps such an inaugurated eschatology is more widespread in Jewish literature than has yet been realised.

2. *Inaugurated Eschatology and the Pre-Gospel Tradition*

The conclusions outlined above also have some implications for the work of Kloppenborg and Crossan, concerned with the pre-gospel tradition. However Hellenised it may have been, this tradition was deeply rooted in Judaism and the evidence of Jewish texts such as *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction* is therefore of relevance to it. Two principal criticisms of this work are suggested by the study of *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*.

First, distinguishing strata on the basis of whether they are marked by realised or future eschatologies would seem to be overly simplistic and ignores the possibility of an inaugurated eschatology. Whether or not this latter eschatology does indeed characterise Q must be assessed in the context of a discussion of the hypothetical gospel source; the present work simply suggests that such an assessment will be a crucial aspect of future research on the pre-gospel traditions and that the work of Kloppenborg and Crossan cannot be fully accepted until they integrate this criticism into their own research.

Second, the idea that the disruption of a tight topical or formal arrangement indicates the presence of secondary intrusions must be questioned in the light of our study of *4QInstruction*, where apocalyptic material sometimes intrudes rather randomly upon instructional material, and within which topical arrangements are loose, often broken up by other material.

These two criticisms are, in fact, of major importance, since they cut to the heart of the analysis of pre-gospel traditions provided by Kloppenborg and Crossan. As such, they are of importance to all discussions of the pre-gospel tradition and the process by which it may have developed. The effect of these criticisms upon this discussion may well prove of further importance to research on the Synoptic Gospels, as they highlight some serious weaknesses in the idea that apocalyptic or

sapiential "trajectories" may be traced through the strata of Q and into the Synoptics. If the hypothetical stratification of Q breaks down, then the evidence for such trajectories becomes questionable.

3. *Inaugurated Eschatology and Matthew*

A significant amount of evidence points to the fact that Matthew's eschatology is also inaugurated, and that it centres upon the revealing of wisdom to an elect group.

The narrative preceding the Sermon on the Mount suggests to the reader that he or she is reading about events of eschatological significance, depicted in terms of both *fulfilment* and *new beginning*. Moreover, the teaching found within the Sermon itself cannot adequately be explained only as *halakah* concerning the proper interpretation of Torah; rather, the only adequate category is that of revealed wisdom. This is demonstrated by a number of aspects of the text: the presence of Moses/Sinai imagery in 5:1 and 8:1, bracketing the teaching of Jesus, is suggestive of a fresh revelation; the so-called "antitheses" of 5:21–48 make ethical pronouncements with no recourse to Scripture or to any authority other than Jesus' own, giving them the character of a prophetic message; the fact that one's response to Jesus' words becomes the criterion by which one is judged (7:24,26) reinforces the impression that he is revealing wisdom by which those who receive it can live in righteousness. Thus, Jesus is presented as a revealer of wisdom in the context of the inauguration of the eschatological time.

This is developed in Matthew 11–12, arguably the narrative centre of the gospel. These chapters are essentially concerned to place the general Jewish rejection of Jesus and his teaching—and, conversely, the positive Gentile response—within an eschatological framework. Thus, the reply to John's question concerning Jesus' messianic identity (11:2–6) focuses instead on the character of the present time as eschatological, as does Matthew's alteration of tenses in the statement concerning the greatness of the Baptist (11:11). The redactional alteration of the phrase "Wisdom is proved right by her children" to "Wisdom is proved right by her works" (11:19) recalls 11:2, which in turn recalls the miracle stories of chapters 8 and 9. Novakovic's study of the Davidic associations of these miracles suggests that their key significance is eschatological rather than Christological; the latter may only be derived from the former. Thus, the alteration again develops the idea that the present

time is eschatological. In its context, closing the section that presents "this generation" as children in the marketplace, it also draws attention to the fact that Jesus' contemporaries are rejecting his eschatologically revealed wisdom, a fact that will be developed in later chapters of Matthew. Again, the idea that the present time is eschatological is probably intended by the depiction of Jesus as greater than the temple in the context of the Sabbath controversies (12:6).

The other sections of narrative in Matthew 11–12 also involve this eschatological dimension. Crucially, though, they develop the idea that the rejection of Jesus' eschatological wisdom is a consequence of a spiritual blindness arising from Satanic influence upon Israel; understanding therefore requires a divine enabling. The latter dimension of this begins to emerge in the statement of 11:15, concerning John's eschatological status: "He who has ears, let him hear." Similar language occurs in Matthew 13:9 and 43, in the context of Jesus' parables. Matthew 13:10–17, which articulates the parable-theology that underlies this chapter, depicts Jesus' revelation as only being understood by those who have been divinely enabled to do so. It is impossible, therefore, to see Jesus' wisdom as open to all (as Lybæk and Luz have argued): rather, it is a wisdom for an elect group, who are miraculously enabled to understand it. It becomes clear in the remaining sections of Matthew 11–12 that few among Israel belong to this group: the accusation that his exorcistic ministry is enabled by Beelzeboul is depicted as a blasphemy against the eschatological work of God's Spirit, as he liberates God's people from the Satanic powers that occupy them; this is taken up by the passage on the seven unclean spirits. Together, these passages imply that Israel is a haunt of demonic powers and that their rejection of Jesus' wisdom is a consequence of this. The redefining of insider/outsider that takes place in the incident with Jesus' family—now it is those who do the will of God, something possible only for those to whom Jesus has revealed that God (11:25–30), who are his family—is a natural corollary of this and a fitting conclusion to the narrative web of chapters 11 and 12.

None of this implies that Torah is evil: as throughout the gospel, Matthew seeks in these chapters to locate Jesus within a matrix of Old Testament expectation, through a number of allusions and by his creative citation of Isaiah 42:1–4. But there is, surely, the same implication that Torah is inadequate as was observed in the Sermon on the Mount: only Jesus' wisdom can truly give rest and show people how they are to walk before God.

Matthew 24–25 develop these themes still further. The fall of the temple is depicted as being part of an eschatological scenario, with

Matthew's redaction of the disciples' question (24:3) and his heavy use of second-person forms laying stress upon the fact that it will be witnessed by those disciples. This says clearly that the present time is eschatological. Nevertheless, here more than at any other point in the gospel the fact that Matthew's eschatology is inaugurated rather than realised is clear, as the discussion of the fall of the temple leads naturally into a discussion of the enthronement of Jesus and his return for judgement. Non-eschatological readings of this material have been proposed by Wright, but there are strong narrative arguments against these. Thus, the gospel retains an important future dimension to its eschatology.

Again, though, the importance of Jesus' revelation is emphasised within this. A web of connections exists between the depiction of the fall of the temple as a result of Israel's rejection of Jesus and the criteria used in the final judgement, as reflected in the eschatological parables of chapter 25. This has the effect of turning the destruction of the temple into a type of what will befall those who reject Jesus' wisdom. The fall of the temple prefigures the last judgement in a way that draws attention to the importance of receiving Jesus and his teaching.

In summary, it is quite clear that throughout Matthew an inaugurated eschatology, similar to that seen in *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*, is operative, within which Jesus is depicted as a revealer of heavenly wisdom to an elect minority divinely enabled to understand his teaching. Matthew's concern to present Jesus as a sage—so well demonstrated by Witherington—accords well with this, and it is unsurprising that the sapiential aspect of the gospel is so well developed. But we should not lose sight of the fact that this is essentially an apocalyptic view of revelation, differentiated from other prophetic models by the emphasis on wisdom being revealed to an elect minority. The developed apocalyptic aspect of the gospel is also, therefore, explained.

Thus, the concept of "inaugurated eschatology" is the key to explaining why Matthew has developed both sapiential and apocalyptic elements within his narrative. Previous theories have concerned one or other of these dimensions of Matthew's Gospel; the thesis developed here is capable of explaining both. This point may have far reaching implications for research on Matthew, as it raises several interesting questions: is such an eschatology unique to Matthew among the Synoptics or do the other gospels exhibit it also? How might Matthew's inaugurated eschatology relate to that of Paul? Does such an eschatology extend into the writings of the early Fathers, or is it a more distinctively Jewish concept? The list of questions could, perhaps, be multiplied: if eschatology

is a key element of Matthew's narrative, then identifying the nature of that eschatology must inevitably have implications for Matthean and New Testament studies.

4. *Restored Creation in Matthew*

A more cautious case may be made for the idea being operative in Matthew that Jesus' wisdom enables the community that lives by it to recover a state of fidelity to God's creation patterns and thus to constitute, in some sense, a restored creation.

There is some evidence that suggests the character of the ethical requirements in the Sermon on the Mount is best explained as a recovery of the pristine standards of the original creation. This emerges particularly from a study of the antitheses (5:21–48): those concerning marital ethics (5:27–30 and 5:31–2) may be compared with the discussion of marriage in 19:3–12, where the creation narrative provides the basis for Jesus' stance on marriage and where the Mosaic provision for divorce is regarded in a negative light; the antithesis concerning love for enemies (5:43–48; this may also be true of the preceding one, in verses 38–42, concerning retaliation) is grounded in the *imitatio dei*, which in turn is grounded in the *imago dei*; though less demonstrable and less certain, the idea of *imago dei* may be argued to underlie the other two antitheses, with contempt for those bearing God's image being prohibited (5:21–22) and absolute truthfulness being expected from those made in that image (5:33–37).

Further evidence for the idea of the restoration of creation is also seen in 6:19–34, a passage which draws in sapiential fashion upon natural images to speak of the restoration of the creature-Creator relationship and to depict the proper character of dependence upon God, the Creator, within the kingdom. The text proves to be doubly interesting, however: it fuses these natural images with an apocalyptic dualism and is undergirded by an eschatological outlook within which the "reward" for a restored relationship with the Creator will only be truly known in the future. In addition to suggesting the idea of restored creation, therefore, the text serves to demonstrate that Matthew's eschatology is inaugurated rather than fully realised.

There is little to be seen of the idea of restored creation in Matthew 11–12, although the stress on the revelation by Jesus of God himself—not merely his will—in 11:25–30, is similar to that found in the "glory

of Adam" passage in 1QS 4:22–3. It may be best not to make too much of this link, but it is suggestive nonetheless.

In summary, there is evidence for the idea of restored creation in Matthew, and in the case of the antitheses it opens up some fruitful lines of enquiry. As a whole, however, the evidence is less compelling than that for an inaugurated eschatology and, perhaps significantly, depends heavily on a comparison with other Jewish literature, especially in the case of the presentation of the temple. The evidence, then, suggests that this is a possibility, but one that requires further research.

5. *Wisdom Christology in Matthew*

An important aspect of this study has been an evaluation of the arguments for a Wisdom-Christology being operative in Matthew. The small number of texts that are held to support such a view place sayings ascribed to personified Wisdom, either in Q or in Sirach, on the lips of Jesus. Witherington has made an important contribution to the discussion by examining this phenomenon in the context of Matthew as a whole, providing evidence that the evangelist is concerned to present Jesus as a figure of wisdom, a sage.

The idea that I have outlined in this study—that Jesus is an eschatological revealer of wisdom—seems to me capable of explaining a greater number of features of Matthew's Gospel than does the idea of a Wisdom-Christology. It easily explains the placing of wisdom-sayings on the lips of Jesus, as one closely identified with Wisdom. It also explains why Matthew has arranged his material in such a way as to emphasise that Jesus is a sage. But, importantly, it also explains the fact that Matthew has developed apocalyptic ideas and elements to a greater extent than the other gospels, something that Wisdom-Christology fails to do.

Those who have argued for a Wisdom-Christology in Matthew and elsewhere in the New Testament, have done so with two goals in view. The first is to explain the development of the doctrine of pre-existence in early Christianity and to provide a Jewish background to this view; Robert Hammerton-Kelly, in particular, has sought to do this. There is nothing, however, in Matthew's redaction to suggest such a concern with pre-existence; his narrative simply does not address itself to this issue—unlike, for example, the prologue to John's Gospel (John 1:1–18).

The other goal of those who have argued for a Wisdom-Christology is

to defend the idea that a "high" Christology, in which Jesus is portrayed as divine, goes back to the early Church and possibly the historical Jesus; Ben Witherington's work is an example of this. Does abandoning the idea that such Christology is operative in Matthew mean abandoning such a Christology? Not, I think, if the relationship between the idea of revelation and the depiction of Jesus as "Son of God" is appreciated.

As noted in our study of Matthew, Jack Kingsbury has argued that the primary Christological title in Matthew is "Son of God" and that all other titles are of lesser importance and ultimately are subordinated to this. Kingsbury has been criticised for minimising the significance of the other titles and for illegitimately transferring their significance to "Son of God,"[1] criticisms that are valid and widely acknowledged. Yet the importance of the title Son of God within the Matthean narrative is undeniable.[2] What is striking is that the title relates strongly to our key theme of eschatological revelation. That this is the case may be seen in the account of Peter's confession that Jesus is "the Christ, the Son of God," an insight that he is informed was possible only because of divine revelation (16:16–17). This instance of association of Jesus' Sonship with revelation is one in which that Sonship is the *content* of revelation and in which, by implication, God is the revealer. Such an emphasis is consistent with the theology of the works studied in chapters 1 and 2, especially the Animal Apocalypse and *4QInstruction*, where God is the one who opens eyes or ears and thus may be understood as the one enabling understanding. Yet in other contexts, notably in 11:25–30, Jesus' Sonship is not the content of revelation, but rather the basis for his ability to function as a revealer. The emphasis in these verses that Jesus' Sonship functions as such a basis is not what we would expect if a Wisdom-Christology was operative in the gospel. The overlap of vocabulary with Sirach 6 and 51 is easily explained: the central emphasis on Jesus as a revealer of wisdom facilitates the uptake of language from the sapiential tradition, just as was the case in *1 Enoch* and *4QInstruction*. As for the fact that it occurs in first-person form, Sirach 51 attests to the fact that the sage could often speak as one closely identified with the wisdom he transmits, without requiring that he is in some sense the incarnation of divine Wisdom. The alternative proposal of Davies and Allison—that the allusion is to Moses—is tenuous and has found little support.

---

[1] See Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher*, 291.

[2] Thus, for instance, the Matthean expansion of Peter's confession: "You are the Christ, the Son of the Living God" (Matt 16:16).

It is at this point that the portrayal of Jesus in Matthew differs radically from the portrayal of Enoch in the works that make up the Enochic "testamentary collection." Enoch is a wise man, taken to heaven and given revelation of cosmic and eschatological truths which he then transmits to a remnant group. He is certainly portrayed as humanly unique, but the basis for the knowledge that he transmits is that of the revelation that he himself receives. By contrast, Jesus is a figure capable of revealing salvific wisdom not because of what he has been shown, but because of who he is: he is the Son and because he is the Son he has a unique knowledge of the Father, the kind of knowledge of someone that only a family member can have. Given the importance of the theme of revelation to Matthew, and given the importance of 11:25–30 on a narratival level to the gospel, this means that my study actually dovetails with this aspect of Kingsbury's work. A major part of Matthew's concern to present Jesus as the Son of God is his concern to present him as the revealer and surely the converse is also true: a major part of his concern to present him as revealer is his concern to present him as Son of God. Thus, by rejecting the Wisdom-Christology proposals of Suggs, Deutsch and Witherington we have not abandoned a major plank for seeing Matthew as displaying a high Christology. Quite the opposite: a "revealer-Christology," as Matthew develops it, requires a view of divine Sonship that is as high as one can imagine, for the Sonship is not one of status, but of actual relationship.

It is interesting, on this level, to compare and contrast Matthew's depiction of Jesus as revealer with the depiction of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch. The latter figure has certainly transcended any human status and has been seated on the divine throne and entrusted with the usually divine function of eschatological judgement. To this extent, as we noticed in our study of the Parables, the Son of Man participates in the divine "identity," to use the language of Bauckham. There remains, however, a sense that the Son of Man participates only partially or equivocally in this and that even this participation is a matter of his election to the role. By contrast, while election is an important idea in Matthew, seen particularly in the use of Isaiah 42:1–2 in Matt 12:18–21, the central depiction of Jesus as "Son of God" brings to the fore the issue of relationship, rather than the status or function issues developed in the Parables.

In fact, this point brings us back to the question of the significance of the "Son of David" title and Matthew's distinctive use of it. I have argued already that this is primarily a Messianic title, indicating that Jesus is the Davidic king. On this level it functions, in Matthew, primarily

as an eschatological phrase, indicating that the present time is the messianic time, the time of the King. What is important here is that the connection of this the title Messiah, or Christ, in 16:16 with the title "Son of God" indicates a development in understanding of the Davidic Messiah: he is no longer simply David's Son but also God's Son. The roots of this idea may be traced to the covenant of 2 Samuel 7:14; it seems that Matthew reflects the growing Christian conviction that this language was truly fulfilled in Jesus, the one who was both David's son and God's Son. Solomonic connections may be noted here, but it seems striking that Matthew does not develop these in a sapiential but rather in an eschatological direction, as Novakovic's study effectively demonstrates.

The present study therefore provides support for Kingsbury's primary suggestion, that the "Son of God" title is of special importance within the Matthean presentation, yet is also suggests that the interweaving of the various titles used of Jesus is complex and, to some extent at least, driven by his concerns to present Jesus as the eschatological revealer.

6. 2 (Slavonic) Enoch *and the Transmission of Inaugurated Eschatological Ideas*

The study of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* in chapter 5 was deliberately presented in terms of the known (and likely) contexts of transmission of *2 Enoch.* Certainty over its origins is, at this stage, impossible, but we know that it was transmitted eventually into the Slavic environment, almost certainly from Christian Greek circles. The presence of Christian interpolations, Byzantine ideas and Bogomil concepts testifies to the kind of circles it was transmitted in, and they undoubtedly included Christian ones.

2 Enoch reflects a basic eschatological thrust similar to that seen in the other three texts studied. Enoch's wisdom will be revealed to his sons and then to a final generation who will arise in the midst of the rapaciousness of those around them. Possession of revealed wisdom is, therefore, once again constitutive of the eschatological community. The emphasis on future judgement, now understood as an event "built-in" to the very structure of creation, ensures that the eschatology of the text is understood as "inaugurated" rather than "realised."

More clearly and explicitly than any of the other texts studied, *2 Enoch* presents revealed wisdom as facilitating a fidelity to the will of the Creator. Ethics are grounded in the creation visions of Enoch, although

an awareness of one's responsibilities and roles within the creation now includes an awareness of the judgement to come. Eschatology and creation are thus uniquely fused in this text as a basis for ethics.

It is clear, therefore, that inaugurated eschatological ideas continued to be transmitted in Christian environments, particularly in the East. Of course, *2 Enoch* is not unique in being transmitted in these contexts, and of the texts we have studied Matthew has also been transmitted in such environments. However, *2 Enoch* is worthy of note for two reasons. The first is that these elements of its narrative are startlingly explicit. The fact that Matthew's emphasis on revealed wisdom has received little attention from scholars testifies to the fact that it is a subtle feature of the Matthean narrative. By contrast, inaugurated eschatology and revealed wisdom are not only at the core of *2 Enoch* but also lie on its surface. It is hard, then, to imagine the work being transmitted without these eschatological ideas being understood and processed by tradents. The second point essentially reinforces this: the presence of interpolations and the existence of recensions indicate that *2 Enoch* has not been transmitted passively but has been processed and manipulated. The nature of those processes will be fascinating to study, once a critical edition of the text is available; the point of note at present is that this indicates that the eschatological ideas of *2 Enoch* would have been processed to some extent or another. Explicitly inaugurated eschatology, centred on revealed wisdom, continued to be part of the thought-world of later Christianity. We may speculate on how this was related to Christian faith; I suggested in the course of my study that the similarity of *2 Enoch* to Matthew's Gospel would allow readers to relate Enoch and his wisdom more easily to Jesus. This remains speculative, but we are still left with a strong witness to inaugurated eschatological ideas in the Christian East.

Concluding Statement

In the opening chapter of this book I cited an article by George W.E. Nickelsburg, entitled "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees and Some Qumranic Documents."[3] In that article, in which he argues that the category of revealed wisdom is constitutive

[3] In Chazon and Stone (eds.), *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, 92–119.

of a chosen minority group, Nickelsburg explores some implications for broader studies. He suggests that it will be helpful to "probe the texts contemporary to 1 Enoch, Jubilees and the Qumran documents in order to examine their expressed attitudes about revelation, whether positive or negative."[4] He also suggests that it is important to explore questions of continuity and discontinuity with the Persian period and with Christianity, concluding:

> These issues touch the heart of much that has been written about the discontinuity between Judaism of the Greco-Roman period and both its Israelite predecessors and its Christian successors.[5]

I hope that this book has begun to explore further the issues that Nickelsburg has raised.

[4] Ibid., 118.
[5] Ibid., 119.

APPENDIX

PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON WISDOM AND APOCALYPTIC IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

1. *Apocalyptic Elements in Matthew*

The most significant work yet to have appeared on the presence of apocalyptic elements in the Gospel of Matthew is David Sim's *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*.[1] A number of other works, however, preceded this monograph and Sim explicitly set out to move beyond the deficiencies of these;[2] it will be important, therefore, to briefly summarise their contributions to this subject area, despite some reservations as to whether or not all of these studies are actually concerned with the presence of apocalyptic elements within the gospel rather than simply with end-time expectation.

Sim begins his own literature survey by mentioning B.H. Streeter's seminal work, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*.[3] This work identifies the prominence of end-expectation in Matthew[4] together with the presence of a cluster of "apocalyptic" concepts[5] before concluding that the gospel "must have been written during a period of intense Apocalyptic expectation."[6] It is noteworthy that the focus of Streeter's comments is on end-time expectation, with which the term "apocalyptic" is more or less conflated. This conflation is further reflected by his discussion of Matthew's date and provenance, in which he links the predominance of this aspect of Matthew with the resurgence of apocalyptic speculation after the Jewish War.[7]

---

[1] David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, SNTSMS 88 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

[2] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 14.

[3] B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, (London: Macmillan, 1924).

[4] Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 520–1.

[5] Ibid., 521–2.

[6] Ibid., 523.

[7] Ibid., 523. Sim's summary of this aspect of Streeter's thought brings out how deep this conflation runs: he comments that the *Nero Redivivus* myth, "served to fuel even further the fire of apocalyptic speculation." See *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 3–4.

The next work of importance is that of G. Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew."[8] Bornkamm examined the eschatological material within Matthew, noting the dominance of end-expectation and ecclesiology in all of the major sections of the book,[9] before going on to examine more closely the theme of "better righteousness," the distinctive fusion of the Law with the teaching of Jesus. He concludes this section with these words: "Matthew reaches his radical understanding of the law by regarding it in the light of the will of God made known in creation, but more still in the sense of the universal judgement, which all men, and particularly his disciples, have to face."[10] The recognition of the importance of creation by Bornkamm is tantalising, but he left the point undeveloped and his failure to see the relationship between these two motivating factors is obvious. The study continues by examining the relationship of Christology and Law, arguing that the Messiah's key role in Matthew is "interpretation of the law."[11] The final section of the chapter addresses itself to the relationship of ecclesiology and Christology, arguing that the idea of the church as *corpus mixtum* is a major development of the Matthean work,[12] and emphasising the function of end-time expectation as paraenetic, urging the church to be prepared for the judgement it will face. Indeed, as Sim notes,[13] this understanding of the purpose of end-time expectation runs through Bornkamm's whole article. It should be stressed in his defence that Bornkamm does not set out to examine what he calls apocalyptic elements in the gospel: his specific concern is with "end-time expectation" and its relationship to ecclesiology. Sim's discussion of Bornkamm under the umbrella of "apocalyptic eschatology," however, reflects how deep the identification of "apocalyptic" with end-time expectation runs.

---

[8] The references given here are to the English translation "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," pages 15–51 in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H.J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, (London: SCM, 1963). The original German article appeared in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in Honour of C.H. Dodd*, (ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956) 222–269.

[9] "End-Expectation," 15–24.

[10] Ibid., 32.

[11] Ibid., 35.

[12] Ibid., 44.

[13] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 4–6.

The next work to be mentioned is that of Daniel Marguerat, *Le Jugement dans l'Evangile de Matthieu*.[14] This work, like that of Bornkamm, is specifically concerned with one area of what is often discussed under the heading of apocalyptic eschatology: here, the judgement. Marguerat set out to address the absence in scholarly literature of a study dedicated to the theme of judgement in Matthew. Early in the first part of the work, he acknowledges the pre-eminent role of apocalyptic literature in providing images of judgement that would be drawn on by works such as Matthew.[15] At the conclusion of this section, in which Marguerat gives an overview of the judgement material in Matthew, he asks two questions thrown up by this survey:

1. "Quelle fonction l'auteur du premier évangile attribue-t-il au thème du jugement dans son argumentation théologique?"
2. "La distinction que l'on opère entre le matériel traditionnel et l'apport du rédacteur font-ils percevoir, dans le recours au motif du jugement, un écart entre l'évangéliste et ses sources?"

"Curieusement," he continues, "si l'importance de cette problématique en théologie mt est rarement niée, l'exégète débouche actuellement sur une lacune de la recherche."[16]

The core of Marguerat's research, which takes up and develops these questions, is that the importance of the judgement material lies not in a consistent description of the future event, the details of which Matthew makes no effort to bring into a coherent whole,[17] but rather in emphasising the criteria for judgement.[18] Like Bornkamm, then, his research sees the judgement material having a principally paraenetic function, though with obvious Christological implications.

If the works surveyed above saw the significance of apocalyptic elements primarily in terms of their theological and ethical role in paraenesis, a number of more recent articles sought to attach a sociological significance to them. G. Stanton's "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism,"[19] saw a connection between the gospel's anti-Jewish polemic

[14] Daniel Marguerat, *Le Jugement dans l'Evangile de Matthieu* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981).
[15] Ibid., 18.
[16] Ibid., 55.
[17] Ibid., 23–24
[18] Ibid., 25.
[19] G. Stanton, "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism," *BJRL 66* (1984), 264–84.

and the predominance of apocalyptic elements within it. The first two parts of Stanton's article argue for the perception of the Matthean community that it was at odds with both the Jewish and the Gentile worlds. In the third part, he demonstrates the prominence of apocalyptic ideas in Matthew and asks, "Why is there increased prominence given to apocalyptic themes in this gospel? What is the *function* of these traditions?"[20] His answer is sociological: apocalyptic language responds to historical crises, providing comfort and consolation and reinforcing group identity.[21] In the case of Matthew, the language reflects the community's separation from Judaism, a fact Stanton further supports in the final part of his article, in which he examines other Christian texts in which apocalyptic themes come to greater prominence in the context of Jewish opposition.[22]

A similar case was made by Donald Hagner in an article published the following year.[23] Unlike Stanton, Hagner begins with a general overview of the apocalyptic viewpoint and its social contexts[24] before commenting that the "simple realization," that the Matthean community comprised Jewish Christians experiencing opposition from their parent group "will prepare us to expect apocalyptic in the Gospel of Mt."[25] At the heart of both this work and that of Stanton is the understanding that apocalyptic writing is closely connected to a social context of oppression: "Alienation and the experience of hostility and persecution have been shown to be the key sociological factors that stimulate apocalyptic thought."[26] Hagner continues by examining the details of the apocalyptic material in Matthew, noting that "apocalyptic-like"[27] motifs are used in connection with Jesus' advent, and thus refer to the past, alongside more traditionally futurist apocalyptic language and ideas. Hagner sees this combination as a deliberate alteration of the apocalyptic worldview, which was always future-oriented. He closes by noting four functions to this material in Matthew: *instruction* in the two apocalyptic realities of advent and parousia, *encouragement* in the face of persecution, *paraenesis* to moral obedience and *readiness* for the return of Christ.

---

[20] Ibid., 278.
[21] Ibid., 279.
[22] Ibid., 281–3.
[23] D.A. Hagner, "Apocalyptic Motifs in the Gospel of Matthew: Continuity and Discontinuity," *HBT 7* (1985), 53–82.
[24] Ibid., 54–7.
[25] Ibid., 57.
[26] Ibid., 58.
[27] Ibid., 60.

O.L. Cope also argued, in 1989, for a sociological explanation of the prevalence of apocalyptic thinking in Matthew, though he also took up elements of Bornkamm's basic paraenetic explanation.[28] Interestingly, his article suggests an altogether different set of social anxieties to those proposed by Stanton and Hagner: Cope argues that the community is still part of the Jewish parent group and that it is the Jewish war and inter-church division that conspire to create such anxiety.

Also released in 1989 was David E. Orton's study of the positive use of the term γραμματεὺς in Matthew.[29] The sub-title of this work, *Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*, prepares the reader for his findings. Orton examines the use of the term "scribe" in the Old Testament and Second Temple period[30] and then in various contexts that he sees as building up a picture of the "apocalyptic scribe."[31] This latter group of contexts includes the obvious apocalyptic and testamentary works, as well as the information found in Qumran literature, but it also, perhaps surprisingly, includes the writings of Ben Sira. Orton's point is that the key feature of the apocalyptic scribe is that he is a recipient and transmitter of divine revelation, often in a quasi-prophetical sense; such a description is, according to Orton, validly applied to Ben Sira. As the findings of this part of his study are brought to Matthew, and particularly to Matthew 13:52, a text often cited as evidence for a Matthean scribal school,[32] Orton is able to argue that the context of the positive references to the scribe (γραμματύς) in Matthew, especially that of Matthew 13:52, occur in contexts that suggest that the apocalyptic background is the most appropriate and that the designation foregrounds the idea of revelation within the gospel.

By providing a strong literary and theological reason for the reference to the scribe in Matthew 13:52, Orton's work raises an important challenge to the view that Matthew is the product of a scribal school. It also begins to address the question of the relationship of sapiential and apocalyptic elements in the gospel, since a major part of the background

---

[28] O.L. Cope, "To the Close of the Age: The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in the Gospel of Matthew," pages 113–24 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. Louis Martyn*, (ed. J. Marcus and M.L. Soards; JSNTSS 24; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

[29] David E. Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*, (JSNTSS 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

[30] Ibid., 39–61.

[31] Ibid., 62–133.

[32] Orton discusses the works that make this connection: ibid., 165–6.

to the term "scribe" is seen as being in the wisdom literature. Finally, in emphasising the revelatory significance of the term "scribe," and indeed of the apocalyptic dimension of the gospel as a whole, Orton's work does greater justice to the character of the apocalypse genre than those works that focus on the eschatological dimension of that genre (of which more shall be said below).

As mentioned earlier, the most significant work on apocalyptic elements in Matthew's Gospel is that of David Sim.[33] He sought to provide a monograph treatment of the subject, drawing particularly on the suggestion of Stanton that division between the Matthean Christian community and the Jewish parent group provided the social context that explains the increased importance of apocalyptic elements within the gospel. Sim's work proper begins with a statement of his working assumptions, that Matthew's Gospel was probably composed in Syrian Antioch around 80 C.E. and that the evangelist (whoever he might have been) used Mark and Q as his main source documents.[34] He then proceeds to outline his methodology, which is essentially one of redaction criticism.[35] The first major part of the study[36] examines apocalyptic eschatology and apocalypticism; after a discussion of the terminological problems associated with research in this area, Sim adopts a modified version of Koch's eight characteristics of apocalyptic thought:[37]

> 1) Dualism. 2) Determinism. 3) Eschatological woes. 4) The arrival of a saviour figure. 5) The judgement. 6) The fate of the wicked. 7) The fate of the righteous. 8) The imminence of the end.[38]

He then continues by surveying apocalyptic literature in order to demonstrate the presence of each of these characteristics and arguing that they reflect a consistent "apocalyptic eschatology."[39] Sim then addresses

---

[33] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*.
[34] Ibid., 14–5.
[35] Ibid., 15–9.
[36] Ibid., 21–71.
[37] Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, (SBT 2/22 London: SCM, 1972), 28–33. Koch also suggested six *literary* characteristics of the genre apocalypse. These are summarised by Christopher Rowland, in *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 454, as follows: "(i) discourse cycles in which the seer is shown something important about the destiny of man, (ii) spiritual turmoil which leads to some kind of revelation, (iii) paraenetic discourses which offer a kind of 'eschatological ethic,' (iv), pseudonymity (v) symbolism drawing on a vast reservoir of ancient mythology, and (vi) a long literary development and composite character."
[38] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 31–53.
[39] Ibid., 53.

the question of the social setting and function of apocalyptic eschatology, arguing against Grabbe[40] that the consensus that apocalypticism arose in situations of oppression is valid. His criticism of Grabbe is essentially that the evidence used by the latter is late[41] and that his argument proceeds "on the premise that each phenomenon[42] remained substantially the same throughout different historical periods."[43] Sim then proceeds to provide evidence for apocalyptic works arising in situations of historical crisis, summarising a great expanse of both primary and secondary literature in just a few pages.[44] This done, he proceeds to discuss the function of apocalyptic eschatology, drawing to a large extent on P.D. Hanson's work, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*,[45] and suggesting five categories of function:

> 1. Identification and legitimation, 2. explanation of current circumstances, 3. encouragement and hope for the future, 4. vengeance and consolation, 5. group solidarity and social control.[46]

Part 2 of Sim's study[47] brings these findings to Matthew: he examines the gospel for evidence of each of the characteristics of apocalyptic eschatology, before reconstructing Matthew's eschatology and concluding, "It is clear from this reconstruction that the Christian gospel of Matthew ultimately stands firmly within the general Jewish (and Christian) apocalyptic-eschatological tradition which was analysed in Part 1." With this conclusion in place, he then examines the social setting of Matthew's Gospel,[48] drawing conclusions based on the statements made in Part 1, that apocalyptic eschatology arose in situations of conflict and oppression and that it served certain functions within the group.

Sim's work is of major importance in highlighting the importance of apocalyptic ideas within Matthew's gospel and in isolating examples of these throughout its text. The work certainly demonstrates that ideas characteristic of the apocalypses are markedly more present in Matthew than in the other synoptics. Ultimately, however, the book reflects some

---

[40] L.L. Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism," *JSP 4* (1989), 24–27.
[41] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 56–7.
[42] That is, apocalypticism and millenarianism.
[43] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 57.
[44] Ibid., 58–62.
[45] P.D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).
[46] Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 64.
[47] Ibid., 73–177.
[48] Ibid., 181–249.

of the serious deficiencies that more generally characterise scholarly approaches to the subject. First, there is no sensitivity to the diversity of ways in which given elements may be used within the broad range of apocalyptic literature. Sim simply takes Koch's list of characteristics and then trawls the apocalyptic writings for examples that justify the use of the categories. No attention is paid to the question of *how* a given element functions within a given text and whether the same element may be used in another text in service of an entirely different ideology. This leads to a more basic problem: the work flattens out of the diversity of worldviews and opinions reflected by the apocalyptic literature. This problem with Sim's approach is reflected in his use of the phrase "apocalyptic eschatology," which suggests that there is a consistent eschatology throughout the apocalyptic writings.[49] Second, Sim's treatment of Matthew, like his treatment of the apocalyptic texts, simply trawls for examples of his list of characteristics. Reading this section, one is more conscious of his desire to prove the presence of an apocalyptic eschatology than of any desire to identify the distinctive characteristics of Matthew's eschatology or to suggest how this might function within Matthew's overall theology (except insofar as that theology can support Sim's reconstruction of the Matthean social setting). Finally, the discussion of social contexts for apocalypticism is over-simplistic, a point arising from the sheer amount of material that is summarised on pages 58–62. Sim barely explores the range of discussion of social contexts of each apocalyptic work and seems not to notice the fact that his criticism of Grabbe—that he assumes a consistency to apocalypticism in different periods and places—also has implications for Sim's own argument, principally that there is a danger in moving away from the detailed study of specific texts towards making generalisations about their contexts.

2. *Sapiential Elements in Matthew*

There has been an awareness of Matthew's connections with the wisdom tradition since the early part of the twentieth century, when works by Norden[50] and Weiss[51] suggested that the first gospel presented Jesus

[49] Both of these criticisms are justified by the discussion of apocalyptic terminology in chapter 1.

[50] E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte Religiöser Reden* (Leipzig: Tuebner, 1913), 282–4.

[51] J. Weiss, "Das Logion Mt. 11, 25–30," in *Neutestamentliche Studien: Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag* (Leipzig: Heinrich, 1914), 120–9.

in terms of personified Wisdom. M. Jack Suggs was the first to develop the idea to any significant extent, however. His work[52] set out "to lift the Wisdom motif out of the footnotes of scholarly discussion, where it can be too quickly written off as an unexplained outburst of Johannine ideology."[53] The approach taken is one of redaction criticism. Suggs begins by examining traces of Wisdom[54] speculation in Q, broadly noting some of the connections between this hypothetical document and the Gospel of Thomas and noting also the absence in both of a passion narrative and thus the emphasis placed upon the teaching of Jesus. He concludes, "Q belongs at some point on the line of development which extends from the Wisdom of Solomon (for example) to second century Gnosticism. It is capable of being read as the report of Sophia's action in her envoys."[55] He moves beyond this statement that Q is *susceptible* to such a reading to propose that, in fact, it *invites* such a reading, a proposition based on the statement found in Luke 11:49–51 (paralleled by Matthew 23:34–6). This statement has the "Wisdom of God," sending envoys who are rejected by Israel. Suggs argues that the saying presents Jesus as "Wisdom's final prophet,"[56] and thus presents Jesus using sapiential categories. Suggs remains cautious, however, about using the phrase "Wisdom Christology" to refer to this phenomenon: "What we have in this saying is not, properly speaking, Christology at all: it is Sophiaology."

Suggs proceeds to examine the ways in which this idea is developed by Matthew. He examines Mt 11:19, noting the alteration of the (probably original) Lukan statement from "wisdom is justified by her children" to "by her deeds" and concluding that since this alteration relates back to 11:2, where Jesus' deeds are in view, Matthew must regard Jesus as being "Sophia incarnate."[57] He then returns to the pericope discussed above (Luke 11:49–51) and notes the Matthean redaction, which substitutes "I send you…" for "The Wisdom of God will send…,"[58] arguing that

---

[52] M. Jack Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970).

[53] Ibid., 2.

[54] Here, and in numerous places in the following discussion, I will use "Wisdom" (capitalised) to denote the idea of the personified/hypostasised divine attribute, in contrast to "wisdom" (uncapitalised) to denote the genre.

[55] Ibid., 13.

[56] Ibid., 28.

[57] Ibid., 58.

[58] Ibid., 58–61.

the alteration reflects Matthew's desire to present Jesus as Wisdom incarnate.

The following chapter takes up the issue by examining, first, the lament found in Matthew 23:37–9 (par. Lk 13:34–5) which Suggs assumes (in its original Q form) to be the speech of Sophia "in view of the fact that the remainder of the pericope accords so well with what is known of the portrait of Wisdom in Judaism."[59] Suggs fails, however, to provide any parallels for the central image of the hen and chicks in the wisdom tradition, an omission that weakens his subsequent argument that Matthew again transfers Wisdom's role to Jesus. Suggs then turns his attention to Matthew 11:25–30, noting the customary parallel with Sirach 51:26–7 and again suggesting that by having Jesus invite hearers to take up *his* yoke, and not that of personified Wisdom, Matthew has again transferred Wisdom's role to Jesus. The key development of this chapter is Suggs's recognition of the link between this transfer and Matthew's presentation of Jesus as *the Son*: "Now the Son is identified with Wisdom."[60]

The final stage of Suggs's work involves an examination of the relationship of Wisdom (embodied in Jesus) and Law in Matthew. The study begins by taking up the "easy yoke" imagery of Matthew 11:28–30, arguing that this imagery presents Jesus as the fulfilment of, "not an alternative to the yoke of the Torah."[61] Suggs then examines the Sermon on the Mount, arguing that the relationship between Wisdom and Torah means that Jesus (as the embodiment of Wisdom-Torah) always pronounces "the proper interpretation of the law and its literal establishment."[62] Thus, the "I say unto you…" clause of the so-called antitheses in Matthew 5 "is the authoritative declaration of what in fact the law is."[63] He concludes by briefly examining the presentation of the disciples as "scribes" in 28:18–20.

The influence of Suggs's work on subsequent scholarship has been huge. As will be highlighted by chapter 6 of the present work, many continue to affirm his basic understanding of the identification of Jesus with Wisdom in certain passages. Several telling criticisms may be levelled at it, however. The greatest of these is one acknowledged

---

[59] Ibid., 67.
[60] Ibid., 96.
[61] Ibid., 106.
[62] Ibid., 114.
[63] Ibid., 114.

by Suggs himself:[64] the study makes little effort to relate the findings to the Matthean work, and its theology, as a whole. This deficiency alone would call for further research. Second, the work is based on an extremely small number of Matthean texts, and thus on a rather slender textual basis.[65] Third, for the most part the redaction of Matthew can only be effective in identifying Jesus with Wisdom if the reader has access to the original Q source. Without this, there is little in the text itself to suggest that he is to be understood in this way; the only text that really has a claim to this is Matthew 11:28–10, since the links with Sirach seem to place it into a more widely known sapiential stream, and even here scholars do not universally accept the link.

Fred W. Burnett took up Suggs's conclusions in his 1981 work, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia*.[66] This work argues that the redactional alterations made by Matthew in 23:37–9, changing a reference to the Wisdom of God to a first-person statement by Jesus, has the effect of transforming Jesus' eschatological discourse (found in Matthew 24) into the "testament"[67] of incarnate Sophia. The thesis proper begins with an examination of the Wisdom-Christology proposed by Suggs, which Burnett endorses and sets in the context of "the pre-Matthean picture of the rejection of Wisdom."[68] Burnett sees the rejection of Jesus, which is so prevalent in the Matthean narrative, as reflecting this idea of Wisdom's rejection and regards this theme as reaching its climax in Matthew 23:37–39. He then turns to examine the discourse found in 24:3–42, noting that the absence of visionary elements (among other things) makes problematic the simple categorisation of this discourse as apocalyptic. He notes the alternative idea, that the speech is a farewell discourse, and highlights several problems with this view before concluding that the best approach is to understand the discourse as a "testament," comparable with the testamentary material in the Epistle of Enoch, which he sees as reflecting the confluence of the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions. With this view in place, he proceeds to argue that the Matthean redaction of the disciples' question in 24:3 has the

[64] Ibid., 1.

[65] For this criticism, see Stanton, *The Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 181.

[66] Fred W. Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew* (Washington: University Press of America, 1981).

[67] For a basic discussion of this genre and its connection with the apocalyptic genre, see Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 127–44.

[68] Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus Sophia*, 94–8.

effect of creating a caesura between Jesus' prediction of the fall of the temple (24:1–2) and the discourse that follows, which Burnett regards as exclusively eschatological advice to the disciples and no longer concerned with the temple. This last point requires Burnett, in the subsequent discussion of the discourse, to reinterpret the material concerning the "abomination of desolation" (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως) as referring to the desecration of Christian sanctuaries. Following the detailed examination of the discourse, Burnett concludes by exploring the implications of his study for Matthean theology as a whole.

Burnett's study has two major flaws, which may explain why it has largely fallen into the background of Matthean studies, unlike Suggs's work. First, the same fundamental criticism of Suggs may be levelled at Burnett: both argue that the Matthean redaction is intended to identify Jesus with Wisdom, but this identification could only be made by those capable of comparing Matthew's gospel with the sources behind it. Second, his attempt to loose the discourse in chapter 24 from the fall of the temple is problematic, both in the argumentation and in the conclusions (such as seeing the "abomination" language as referring to the desecration of Christian sanctuaries). More positively, his attempt to link the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish leaders to the rejection of Wisdom is certainly a commendable effort to provide a broader textual basis for Wisdom Christology in Matthew, but one must ask whether the idea of Wisdom's *rejection* was as well attested as he believes, given that he sees the *locus classicus* for the idea as being *1 Enoch* 42:1–3. Even if the idea was common, it is more likely, given the absence of more explicit references to Jesus as Wisdom, that the rejection of Jesus is the dominant theme in the gospel and that the allusion to the rejection of Wisdom is just that: an allusion. Finally, his argument that the discourse in chapter 24 reflects the confluence of wisdom and apocalyptic is interesting but undeveloped: he simply places the eschatological discourse into the mouth of Wisdom incarnate and neglects more interesting issues, such as the relationship between the material in chapter 24 and the parables of chapter 25.

Celia Deutsch's 1987 monograph, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*,[69] examines the redactional development of 11:25–30 (concluding that 11:25–7 belong to Q and 11:28–30 to M) before breaking it into its two

[69] C. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30*, (JSNTSS 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).

subsections and examining the themes in each by means of a comparative study with other roughly contemporary Jewish literature. She concludes that Matthew "used notions of apocalyptic revelation, Sonship, Wisdom, the yoke and *anawim* vocabulary (1) to interpret Jesus' identity and meaning, and (2) to spell out his call to discipleship."[70] Aware that Matthew's contemporaries, against whom he and his community defined themselves, also had access to these categories, Deutsch stresses that the author of the first gospel "uses them to say to his disciples that Jesus is the authoritative revealer and teacher of wisdom because he is Wisdom personified."[71] It is worth noting that, again, Deutsch sees the proper interpretation of Torah as a crucial dimension to this.[72]

The first two criticisms of Suggs, above, hold true for Deutsch's work also:[73] it is a slender textual basis that is examined and there is no attempt to relate the findings to Matthew's wider theology. Nevertheless, the recognition that the pericope draws upon apocalyptic ideas of revelation takes the work beyond that of Suggs. The relationship of Jesus to the Torah, however, requires further examination: as we have seen throughout the present study, the role played by the Torah within certain apocalyptic texts (specifically *1 Enoch*, which Deutsch draws on)[74] is at best marginal and possibly negative.

Ben Witherington's 1995 work, *Jesus the Sage*,[75] sought to address some of these weaknesses. This work traces the development of the wisdom genre, with particular attention given to the way in which Wisdom is personified or hypostasised. It helpfully examines the currents of traditional and counter-order wisdom, allowing each text studied to provide its own unique contribution and exploring the relationship between Wisdom and Torah. Particularly noteworthy here is the fact that in the later Wisdom texts such as Sirach 24, Wisdom is portrayed as the greater category, with Torah being portrayed as its supreme earthly embodiment: "The special embodiment of Wisdom in Torah does not exclude her presence elsewhere. While Torah is indeed all the good things that can be said about Wisdom, since she resides therein, Wisdom is not confined

[70] Ibid., 143.
[71] Ibid., 143.
[72] Ibid., 143.
[73] This point is true also of Deutsch's subsequent work, *Lady Wisdom, Jesus and the Sages: Metaphor and Social Context in Matthew's Gospel*, (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996).
[74] Ibid., 64–74.
[75] Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

to the Torah."[76] Witherington further notes that in Sirach 24, the understanding of Wisdom is not merely Torah-centric but that within that focus on Torah there is "a stress on the temple cultus and priesthood."[77] He continues, "those who try to insist upon too exclusive an identification of Wisdom with Torah have not fully taken the measure of a sage who could say in the very first chapter of his work that God poured out Wisdom 'upon all his works.'"[78]

Witherington then turns his attention to the various ways in which he sees the New Testament drawing upon this tradition, with its forms and concepts. Of greatest relevance to the present work is chapter 8 of this work, which Witherington entitles, "The Gospels of Wisdom: Matthew and John."[79] Obviously, it is the section of this chapter that deals with the first gospel that is of interest. Witherington understands this gospel as being the product of an author belonging to a school[80] who handles his sources with the conservatism of one who regards himself as an editor rather than as an author.[81] He notes the fact that the term "rabbi" only occurs as an address on the lips of those who fail to acknowledge Jesus' true status as "Lord,"[82] but stresses that the use of the term by Jesus in 23:8–10 points to its validity as a title when properly understood: he is "*the* teacher."[83] This point is developed by the conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus' authority is contrasted with the lack of such authority among "their scribes," those associated with the Pharisees.[84] Witherington then examines several passages that seem to present Jesus and/or his disciples as scribes. Matthew 13:52, the reference to every scribe trained for the kingdom of heaven, is the first to be examined, with a specific kind of scribe being spoken of: "Matthew sees himself and his charges as sapiential scribes of the sort described in

---

[76] Ibid., 96. He also describes Torah as Wisdom's "objective repository" on page 98.
[77] Ibid., 97.
[78] Ibid., 98.
[79] Ibid., 335–380. To a lesser extent, chapter 5 bears relevance by providing an interesting discussion of the sapiential dimensions of Q.
[80] Ibid., 341–3.
[81] Ibid., 343.
[82] Ibid., 344.
[83] Ibid., 344. The emphasis is Witherington's. The term used in Matthew 23:10 is καθηγητὴς, rather than "rabbi." For a more nuanced discussion of this phrase, see Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher; Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*, (Coniectanea Biblica, NT 24; Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1995), 287–90.
[84] Ibid., 345.

Sir 39:1–3 . . . It is the chief job of the sapiential scribe to be an interpreter of the earlier Wisdom, not just in the Torah or in the Wisdom books, but also in this case the Wisdom in the teachings of Jesus."[85] Witherington next argues that the reference to "binding" and "loosing" in Matt. 16:17ff. is to "the practice of making decisions and giving commands on what one is *bound* to do and what one is *free* to do. That is, Peter . . . is given the task, based on the tradition that he has received from Jesus, of interpreting that tradition so as to explain what is and is not permitted in terms of behaviour."[86] Finally, Witherington notes that Matt. 28:18–20 presents the commission of the first disciples in terms of making further disciples and teaching them to obey Jesus' commandments, thus emphasising the sapiential character of the gospel as a whole.

Witherington then proceeds to argue that the gospel as a whole presents Jesus as "David's Son and Lord, Solomon's superior."[87] It is worth tracing at least the first major part of this argument through in some detail, since it represents the most sustained case for a thoroughgoing Wisdom Christology in Matthew that has yet been made. Witherington notes, first, the emphasis of Matthew 1:1 that Jesus is the Son of David, a title repeated at crucial junctures of Matthew's account and "not attested before the *Psalms of Solomon*."[88] This latter point means, according to Witherington, that what we are dealing with here in the title is "a late sapiential and not an Old Testamental way of putting things."[89] The connection he makes is with the person of Solomon, the great patron of wisdom. This claim he sees as reinforced by the events of Matthew 2 (heavenly signs, the visit of seers, power struggles with other kings),[90] though it might be suggested here, in anticipation of more thorough criticism below, that these signs merely reinforce Jesus' kingly or Davidic status and not his Solomonic one. The account of Jesus' baptism is understood explicitly as the reception of the Spirit of Wisdom, a point that Witherington sees as distinctively made by Matthew, who has the voice from heaven address the crowd, rather than Jesus, thus turning the

[85] Ibid., 346.
[86] Ibid., 348.
[87] Ibid., 349. This is the title given to the subsection of the chapter that seeks to work through the gospel as a whole.
[88] Ibid., 353.
[89] Ibid., 353.
[90] Ibid., 353.

event more explicitly into a kingly investiture.[91] He notes the repetition of the phrase in 17:5 at the transfiguration, seeing there Wisdom symbolism in the description of Jesus' appearance, which he parallels with the Wisdom of Solomon 7:26, 29 ("she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness… She is more beautiful than the sun and excels every constellation of the stars.").[92] Again, it may be suggested that the argument here hardly develops a distinctive Matthean sapiential theology, since the transfiguration account is well attested in the other gospel sources and may draw on other traditions than the sapiential one in its symbolism (most obviously the theophany of Sinai). Nevertheless, the connection with the Wisdom of Solomon is then further developed by Witherington, who notes that immediately after the passage cited above is a description of the testing of the king: this is paralleled by the testing in Matthew 4 and then later in Matthew 26–7. The case is hardly convincing since the testing accounts are so distantly separated that the reader is hardly likely to connect them naturally with this citation. As Witherington discusses the quotation from Isaiah 9:1–2 at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry he is on firmer ground, stressing that this is a reference to a Davidic king, though his parallel of Jesus' opening words with those of Wisdom in Proverbs 1:20–3 again feels tenuous.[93] The treatment of the Sermon on the Mount is stronger: Witherington suggests that given the wealth of forms and ideas paralleled in the Wisdom tradition, it would be better to call this section of Matthew "the Teaching on the Mount."[94] Probably of most importance is his assessment that what we have here is "with some exceptions… basically *conventional wisdom*, prefaced by eschatologically oriented beatitudes."[95] By "conventional wisdom," of course, Witherington means the kind found in Proverbs and Sirach, which centres on fidelity to Torah. But when the "exceptions" that he mentions are examined ("words against wealth or any oath taking, love of enemies, no divorce"),[96] the statement begins to ring a little hollow: was seen in Chapter 4 of the present work, the teaching on these areas for the most part falls into a structurally crucial block of material (the

[91] Ibid., 354.
[92] Ibid., 354.
[93] Ibid., 355.
[94] Ibid., 356.
[95] Ibid., 356.
[96] Ibid., 356.

so-called antitheses) that highlights the inadequacy of Torah and affects the reading of the rest of the Sermon. Witherington then examines the miracle-accounts of Matthew 8–9, noting again the importance given to the title "Son of David", and arguing that the background to this is found in traditions that present Solomon as healer.[97] This issue was dealt with more thoroughly in Chapter 5; at this stage it is adequate to note that at the time when Witherington wrote this book, Novakovic's thorough examination of these chapters[98] had not yet been published and therefore Witherington was ignorant of some of the criticisms that she would level at the position taken by the works upon which he drew. The treatment of the commissioning speech in Matthew 10 is also weak: Witherington begins by simply claiming that it is possible to read this as the speech of Wisdom, but ends by seeing it as part of "a consistent, sustained attempt to see Jesus as a Solomonic and even Wisdom figure,"[99] a statement that is made with no further evidence than his previous (problematic) claims that the earlier chapters present Jesus as Solomonic. All of these alleged elements in the Matthean presentation of Jesus underlie Witherington's reprisal of the arguments of Suggs and Deutsch regarding 11:25–30: the criticism of Stanton, that 11:25–30 is too slender a textual base, is rejected on the basis of these strands of evidence from throughout the gospel, which Witherington sees as supporting his interpretation.

Little would be gained from examining the remainder of Witherington's case for a Matthean Wisdom Christology, since we have already stressed its weaknesses over the first half of the gospel and its inability to support his understanding of Matthew 11:25–30. It would seem that his sustained argument for a thoroughgoing Wisdom-Christology is open to some major criticisms.[100]

Yet the problems with this one aspect of Witherington's work do not render all of his conclusions invalid: Witherington has picked up on

---

[97] Ibid., 357.

[98] Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: a Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT 2.170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

[99] Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 358.

[100] Other works may have been noted as proposing a Wisdom Christology in Matthew, notably that of James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM Press, 1989), 197–206 and Robert R.G. Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (SNTSMS 21; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973). Such works, however, are less specifically concerned with the Matthean text and have, as a result, been given little space within the present discussion.

some important points, particularly the way in which Jesus' ministry and the role of his disciples are depicted in sapiential terms of *teacher* and *disciples*, and the way in which this arguably traditional element has, in Matthew's hands, been foregrounded in Matthew 13:57, 23:8–10 and 28:18–20. Moreover, he has rightly recognized the way in which the arrangement of Jesus' teaching into blocks, such as the Sermon on the Mount, and the extent to which Matthew has included teaching omitted by the other gospels or possibly composed additional didactic material reinforce the sense that Jesus' *teaching* has salvific significance. In other words, while a Wisdom Christology may not be defensible in Matthew there remains an emphasis on Jesus as being a Sage, an emphasis on the importance of his Wisdom. The question of how this relates to the apocalyptic elements in Matthew, therefore, remains significant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albani, Matthias. *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube: Untersuchungen zum Astronomischen Henochbuch*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 68. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1994.

Alexander, Philip. "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," Pages 87–122 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible. Edited by* M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Allen, W. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.

Allison, Dale C. "Jesus and Moses (Mt 5:1–2)." *Expository Times* 98 (1987): 203–205.

—— "Jesus and the Victory of Apocalyptic." Pages 126–141 in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's* Jesus and the Victory of God. Edited by Carey C. Newman. Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1999.

—— "The Eye is the Lamp of the Body (Matthew 6:22–23 = Luke 11:34–36)." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 61–83.

—— *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

—— "Two Notes on a Key Text: Matthew 11:25–30." *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 477–485.

Andersen, F.I. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch." Pages 91–221 in Volume 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volumes. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Anderson, Gary A. "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan." Pages 83–110 in *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. Edited by G.A. Anderson, M.E. Stone and J. Tromp. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 15. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Argall, Randall A. *1 Enoch and Sirach. A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*, Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 8, Atlanta: Scholars Press 1995.

—— Beverley A. Bow and Rodney Werline, eds., *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of a Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Aune, David E., ed. *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Bacon, B.W. *Studies in Matthew*. London: Constable, 1930.

—— "The Five Books of Matthew against the Jews." *Expository Times* 15 (1918): 55–66.

Balch, David L., ed., *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*. Fortress: Minneapolis, 1991.

Barker; Margaret. "The Time is Fulfilled: Jesus and Jubilee." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 53 (2000): 22–32.

Barthélemy, D., and J.T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1, DJD I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Bauckham, Richard J. "Apocalypses." Pages 135–187 in *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 1. The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by D.A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2: 140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

—— "Early Jewish Visions of Hell" *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990): 355–385.

—— *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.

—— *James: Wisdom of James, the Disciple of Jesus the Sage*. London: Routledge, 1999.

—— *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.

—— *The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Studien zum Neuen Testament 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Bauer, David R., "The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 130–59 in *Treasures Old and New: Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Edited by David R. Bauer and Mark Allen Powell. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

Bauer, Johannes B. "Das milde Joch und die Ruhe, Matth 11:28–30." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 17 (1961): 99–106.

Beare, Francis Wright. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

—— "The Synoptic Apocalypse: Matthean Version." Pages 115–133 in *Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings*. Edited by John H. Reumann. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1972.

Beasley-Murray, G.R. *Jesus and the Future*. London: Macmillan, 1954.

—— "Jesus and the Spirit." Pages 463–478 in *Melanges biblique en homage au R.P. Beda Rigaux*. Edited by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Ducolot, 1970.

Beaton, Richard. *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*. Society for the Study of the New Testament Monograph Series 123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Berger, Klaus. "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments," *New Testament Studies* 20, (1973/4), 1–44.

—— *Die Weisheitsschriftaus der Kairoer Geniza: Erstedition, Kommentar und Übersetzung*. Tübingen: Franke, 1989.

Berthelot, Kathell. *L'"Humanité de L'Autre Homme" dans la Pensée Juive Ancienne*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 87. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Betz, Hans D. "Cosmogony and Ethics in the Sermon on the Mount." Pages 158–176 in *Cosmogony and Ethical Order: New Studies in Comparative Ethics*. Edited by Robin W. Lovin and Frank E. Reynolds. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Pr, 1985.

—— "Die hermeneutischen Prinzipien in der Bergpredigt." Pages 27–41 in *Verifikationen: Festschrift für Gerhard Ebeling zum 70 Geburstag*. Edited by Eberhard Juengel and Johannes Wallmann. Tubingen: Mohr, 1982.

—— "Die Makarismen der Bergpredigt (Matt 5:3–12): Beobachtungen zur literarischen Form und theologischen Bedeutung." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 75 (1978): 3–19.

—— "Eine Episode im Jüngsten Gericht (Matt 7:21–23)." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 78 (1981): 1–30.

—— "Eschatology in the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 343–350.

—— "Kosmogonie und Ethik in der Bergpredigt." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 81 (1984): 139–171.

—— "Matthew 6:22f and Ancient Greek Theories of Vision." Pages 43–46 in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Edited by Ernest Best and Robert M. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

—— "The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt 11:28–30)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 10–24.

—— "The Problem of Christology in the Sermon on the Mount." Pages 191–209 in *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament, (Festschsrift for Hendrikus W. Boers)*. Edited by T.W. Jennings. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

—— *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1995.

—— "The Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's Interpretation." Pages 258–275 in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger S. Pearson and A. Thomas Kraabel. Minneapolis: Fortress Pr, 1991.

—— "The Sermon on the Mount: its Literary Genre and Function." *Journal of Religion* 59 (1979): 285–297.

Black, Matthew. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece: Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
—— "The Aramaic Dimension in Q, With Notes on Luke 17:22 Matthew 24:26 (Luke 17:23)" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 40 (1990): 33–41.
—— *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. A new English edition with commentary and textual notes. In consultation with J.C. Vanderkam. With an Appendix on the 'Astronomical' Chapters by O. Neugebauer*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
—— "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins." Pages 145–168 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J.C. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism*. The Oxford Bible Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
Blocher, Henri. "The Fear of the Lord as the Principle of Wisdom." *Tyndale Bulletin* 28 (1977): 3–28.
Boccaccini, Gabrielle. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1998.
—— *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E.–200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
Bockmuehl, Markus. *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
Bonner, Campbell, ed. *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1937; repr. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968.
Bonsirven, J. "Les Livres des Secrets d'Hénoch." Pages 227–47 in *La Bible Apocryphe en Marge de l'Ancien Testament. Choises et présentes par Daniel-Rops*. Paris: Libraire Arthéme Fayard, 1953.
Bonwetsch, G.N. *Das slavische Henochbuch*. Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen. Neue Folge.1:3. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896.
—— *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristian Literatur 44. Leipzig: Hinrichs Verlag, 1922.
Bornkamm, G. "Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 419–432.
—— *Gesammelte Aufsätze*. 4 Volumes. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1958–1963.
——, G. Barth & H.J. Held. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
Böttrich, Christfried. *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1995.
—— "Astrologie in der Henochtradition," *Zeitschrift für die altetestamentliche Wissenschaft* 109 (1997): 222–245.
—— "Beobachtungen zum Midrasch vom ‚Leben Henochs.'" *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996): 44–83.
—— *Das slavische Henochbuch*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 5:7. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995.
—— "Das ‚Sanctus' in der Liturgie der hellenistischen Synagoge." *Jahrbuch für Liturgig und Hymnologie* 35 (1994–95): 10–36.
—— *Die Vögel des Himmels haben ihn begraben: Überlieferungen zu Abels Bestattung und zur Ätiologie des Grabes*. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
—— "Früjüdische Weisheitstradition im slavischen Henochbuch und in Qumran." Pages 297–321 in *The Wisdom Texts fromQumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peters Press, 2002.
—— "Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 9 (1991): 35–42.

—— "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 32 (2001): 445–70.
—— *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, Reihe 50. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
Bousset, Willem. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. 1903. 3rd ed. Repr. Tübingen: Mohr, 1966.
Broek, R. van den. *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions.* Etudes Préliminaires aux Religiones Orientales dans l'Empire Romain 24. Leiden: Brill, 1971: 287–304.
Broer, Ingo. "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Aspekte von Mt 24:1–28." *Novum Testamentum* 35 (1993): 209–233.
Brooke, George J. "Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran." Pages 201–220 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peeters-Leuven University Press, 2002.
Brooks, Stephenson H. "Apocalyptic Paraenesis in Matthew 6:19–34." Pages 95–112 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplementary Series 24. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah*. New York: Doubleday, 1977.
—— "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer." *Theological Studies* 22 (1961): 175–208.
Brown, Schuyler. "The Matthean Apocalypse." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 4 (1979): 2–27.
Brown, William P. *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
Buber, Martin. *Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis*. 2nd. Edition. New York: Schocken Books, 1973.
Buchanan, George W. "Matthean Beatitudes and Traditional Promises." Pages 161–184 in *New Synoptic Studies: the Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*. Edited by William R. Farmer. Macon: Mercer Univ Pr, 1983.
Burnett, Fred W. *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew*. Washington: University Press of America, 1981.
Byargeon, Rick W. "Echoes of Wisdom in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9–13)." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41 (1998): 353–365.
Byrskog, Samuel. *Jesus the Only Teacher; Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament 24. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1995.
Cadbury, H.J. "The Single Eye," *Harvard Theological Review* 47 (1954): 69–74.
Caird, George Bradford. "Expounding the Parables: the Defendant (Matthew 5:25f; Luke 12:58f)." *Expository Times* 77 (1965): 36–39.
—— *Language and Imagery of the Bible*. London: Duckworth, 1980.
—— *New Testament Theology*. Completed and edited by L.D. Hurst. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
Camp, C.V. *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1985.
Cangh, J.M. van. "Béatitudes de Qumrân et Béatitudes Évangeliques. Antérioité de Matthieu sur Luc?" Pages 413–426 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
Caquot, A. "La Pérennité du Sacerdoce." Pages 109–16 in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et Affrontements dans le Monde Antique. Mélanges Offerts à Marcel Simon*. Edited by Marcel Simon. Paris: E.de Boccard, 1978.

Carlston, Charles E. "Betz on the Sermon on the Mount—a Critique." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 47–57.
—— and Dennis Norlin, "Once More—Statistics and Q." *Harvard Theological Review 64* (1971): 59–78.
Charrette, Blaine. *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplementary Series 79. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
—— " 'To Proclaim Liberty to the Captives': Matthew 11:28–30 in the Light of OT Prophetic Expectation." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 290–297.
Charles, Robert Henry. *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text, and edited with the introduction notes and indexes of the first edition wholly recast, enlarged and rewritten; together with a reprint from the editor's text of the Greek fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
—— "The Book of Enoch." In R.H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II: Pseudepigrapha.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
—— "The Book of the Secret of Enoch." Pages 425–69 in volume 2 of *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* 2 vols. Edited by R.H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
—— *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.
—— "The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch." *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1921): 161–163.
Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
—— *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research With a Supplement*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 75. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1981.
Clark, K.W. "Realized Eschatology." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59 (1940): 367–83.
Clements, R.E. *Wisdom in Theology*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1992.
Clifford, R.J., and John J. Collins, eds. *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 24. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992.
Collins, John J. "A Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61:1–3 and its Actualization in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 225–240 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by C.A. Evans and S. Talmon, Biblical Interpretation Series 28. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
—— "An Enochic Testament? Comments on George Nickelsburg's Hermeneia Commentary." Pages 373–8 in *George Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. 2 volumes: volume 2. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 80. Edited by Jacob Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
—— *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, with an Essay, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," by Adela Yarbro Collins*. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
—— "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran." Pages 609–618 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts and Reformulated Issues*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
—— "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre." *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–20.
—— *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Old Testament Library. Lousville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
—— *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
—— "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 49–66 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by John

J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies in the Texts from the Desert of Judea 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

—— "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism." Pages 531–548 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by D. Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983.

—— "The Heavenly Representative: The Son of Man in 1 Enoch," Pages 111–133 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by G.W.E Nickelsburg and J.J. Collins. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1981.

—— "The Mysteries of God. Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 287–305 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

—— "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility." Pages 165–185 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Edited by Leo Perdue, Bernard B. Scott and W.J. Wiseman; Lousville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.

—— "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 369–383 in *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Edited by J.J. Collins. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 54. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

—— "Wisdom Reconsidered in Light of the Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 285–297.

—— and James Charlesworth, eds. *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

—— and G.W.E. Nickelsburg, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. California: Scholars Press, 1980.

Congdon, Roger D. "Did Jesus Sustain the Law in Matthew 5?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (1978): 117–125.

Conick, April D. de. "The Yoke Saying in the Gospel of Thomas 90." *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990): 280–294.

Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5. Washington DC: Catholic Bible Association, 1976.

—— "Matthew 25:31–46: 'The Sheep and the Goats' Reinterpreted." *Novum Testamentum* 11 (1969): 32–44.

—— "To the Close of the Age: The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 113–24 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by J. Marcus and M.L. Soards. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplementary Series 24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Coppens, J. *Le Fils d'Homme vétéro—et intertestamentaire*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982.

Correns, Dietrich. "Jona und Salomo." Pages 86–94 in *Wort in der Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien, Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf*. Edited by Wilfred Haubeck and Michael Bachmann. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

Coughenour, Robert A. "The Woe-oracles in Ethiopic Enoch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 9 (1978): 192–197.

Court, J.M. "Right and Left: The Implications for Matthew 25:31–46." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 223–233.

Crenshaw, James L. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.

——, ed. *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*. The Library of Biblical Studies. New York: Ktav, 1976.

—— "Wisdom." Pages 225–264 in *Old Testament Form Criticism*. Edited by J.H. Hayes. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974.

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Death of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

—— *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by S.C. Guthrie and A.M. Hall. London: SCM Press, 1963.
Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone Press, 1956.
Dautzenberg, Gerhard. "Ist das Schwurverbot Mt 5,33–37, Jak 5,12 ein Beispiel für die Torakritik Jesu." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 25 (1981): 47–66.
Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran. A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplementary Series 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1992.
Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document.'* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.
Davies, W.D. "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25–30." *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953): 113–140.
—— *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
—— and Allison, D.C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 volumes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1995.
—— and D. Daube, eds. *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in Honour of C.H. Dodd*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
Davila, James R. *Liturgical Works*. Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
—— "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus." Pages 248–274 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. Studies on the Texts from the Desert of Judah 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
—— "The *Hodayot* Hymnist and the Four who Entered Paradise," *Revue de Qumran* 17/65–68 (1996): 457–78.
—— *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
Day, J., R.P. Gordon and H.G.M. Williamson, eds. *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honor of J.A. Emerton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
Delcor, M. "Le Mythe de la Chute des Anges et l'Origine des Géants comme Explication du Mal dans le Monde dans l'Apocalytique Juive. Histoire des Traditions." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religiones* 190 (1976): 3–53.
—— "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews" *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods 2* (1971): 126–130.
Dell, K.J. "The King in the Wisdom Literature." Pages 163–186 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J. Day. Journal for the Study of thre Old Testament Supplementary Series 270. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998.
Denaux, Albert. "Der Spruch von den zwei Wegen im Rahmen des Epilogs der Bergpredigt (Mt 7:13–14 par Lk 13:23–24): Tradition und Redaktion." Pages 305–335 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jesus – the Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel. Leuven: Leuven Univ Pr, 1982.
Denis, Albert-Marie. *Concordance Grecque des Pseudepigraphes d'Ancient Testament*, Leuven: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1987.
—— *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 1. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
Dequecker, L. "The 'Saints of the Most High' in Qumran and Daniel." *Old Testament Studies* 18 (1973): 108–87.
Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplementary Series 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

—— *Lady Wisdom, Jesus and the Sages: Metaphor and Social Context in Matthew's Gospel*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996.
—— "Wisdom in Matthew: Transformation of a Symbol." Novum Testamentum 32 (1990): 13–47.
Dexinger, Ferdinand. *Henochs Zehnwochenapokalypse und offene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung*. Studia post-Biblica 5:29. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
De Young, James B. "The Function of Malachi 3:1 in Matthew 11:10: Kingdom Reality as the Hermeneutic of Jesus." in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William R. Stegner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Pr, 1994.
Dillmann, August. *Das Buch Henoch Übersetz und Erklärt*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1853.
—— *Lexicon Linguae Ethiopicae cum Indice Latino*. Reprint. New York: Ungar, 1955.
Dimant, Devorah. "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 14–29.
Dinter, Paul Edward. "The Remnant of Israel and the Stone of Stumbling in Zion According to Paul (Romans 9–11)." Ph.D. Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1980.
Dix, G.H. "The Enochic Pentateuch." *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1925–1926): 29–42.
Dodd, C.H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet, 1935.
Doeve, J.W., "Parousieverzögerung." *Nederlands theologisch Tijdschrift* 17 (1962–1963): 33–36.
Doll, P. *Menschenschöpfung und Weltschöpfung in der altetestamentlichen Weisheit*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 117. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwork, 1985.
Duling, Denis C. "'[Do Not Swear . . .] by Jerusalem Because it is the City of the Great King' (Matt 5:35)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 291–309.
—— "Solomon, Exorcism and the Son of David," *Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975): 235–252.
—— "The Therapeutic Son of David: an Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977/8): 392–410.
Dunn, James D.G. "Biblical Concepts of Revelation." Pages 1–22 in *Divine Revelation*. Edited by P.D.L. Avis. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
—— *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM Press, 1989.
—— "Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith from the Beginning?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982): 303–336.
Dupont, Jacques. *Études sur les Évangiles synoptiques*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 70. 2 vols. Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University, 1985.
—— "Les 'simples' (petâyim) dans la Bible et à Qumran: a propos des nepioi de Mt 11:25, Lc 10:21." Pages 329–336 in *Studi sull 'Oriente e la Bibbia, offerti ap Giovani Rinaldi*. Edited by Giorgio Bucaletti. Gênes: Editrice Studio e Vita, 1967.
—— "L'interpretation des Beatitudes." *Foi et Vie* 65 (1966): 17–39.
Elgvin, Torleif. "An Analysis of 4QInstruction." Ph.D. Dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1998.
—— "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgement and Salvation According to *Sapiential Work A*." Pages 126–165 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996.
—— "Renewed Earth and Restored Creation: 4Q475." Pages 577–91 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts and reformulated Issues*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
—— "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation." Pages 113–150 in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplementary Series 290. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998.

—— "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A." in *Revue de Qumran* 16/4, (1995) 559–580.
—— "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century B.C.E.: The Evidence of 4QInstruction." Pages 226–247 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E.Tov and J.C. Vanderkam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
—— "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic." Pages 15–38 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Falk, Daniel K., Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller (eds), Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet. (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000).
Fischer, Loren. "Can this be the Son of David?" Pages 82–97 in *Jesus and the Historian*. Edited by F.T. Trotter. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
—— "Wisdom Christology and the Partings of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 52–68 in *Christian-Jewish Relations Through the Centuries*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Brooke W.R. Pearson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
Förster, M. "Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung. Ein lateinisches Fragment des s. g. slavischen Henoch." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1908): 477–529.
—— "Die mittelirische Version von Adams Erschaffung," *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 13 (1921): 47–48.
Fotheringham, J.K. "The Date and the Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch." *Journal of Theological Studies 20* (1919): 252.
—— "The Easter Calendar of the Slavonic Enoch." *Journal of Theological Studies* 23 (1922): 49–56.
France, R.T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1989.
—— *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.
Frankemölle, Hubert, "Die Offenbarung an die Unmündigen: pragmatische Impulse aus Mt 11,25f." Pages 97–127 in *Chancen und Grenzen religiöser Erziehung*. Edited by Johannes Thiele and Rudolph Becker. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1980.
Frey, Jörg. "Flesh and spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage." Pages 367–403 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peters Press, 2002.
—— "The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage." Pages 197–226 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Fossum, Jarl. "Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism." *Vigiliae Christianae* 37 (1983): 260–287.
—— *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, 1995.
Fuchs, H.F. "Die äthioische Übersetzung des Henoch: Ein Beitrag zur Apokalyptikforschung der Gegenwart," *Biblische Notizen 8* (1979): 36–56.
Fujita, Shozo. "The Metaphor of the Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 7 (1976): 30–45.

Fuller, Reginald H. *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*. Studies in Biblical Theology 12; London: SCM Press, 1954.
Galling, K. *Die Krise der Aufklärung in Israel*. Mainzer Universitätsreden 19. Mainz: Verlag der Johannes Gutenbergbuchhandlung, 1952.
Gammie, John G., ed. *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978.
García Martínez, Florentino. "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 162–192 in *The Encyclopaedia of Apocalypticism, Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 2000.
—— *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992.
—— "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis." *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–36.
—— "Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly." Pages 1–15 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
—— and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 volumes. Leiden: Brill 2000.
Garland, David. *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1993.
Gärtner, B. "The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew." *Studia Theologica* 8 (1955): 1–24.
Gerhardsson, Birger. "Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels." Pages 266–309 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by H. Wansborough. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 64. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
—— *Memory and Manuscript*. Uppsala: Gleerup, 1961.
Gerstenberger, E. "Psalms." Pages 179–223 in *Old Testament Form Criticism*. Edited by J.H. Hayes. San Antonio: Trinity University, 1974.
Gese, Hartmut. "Die Weisheit, der Menschensohn und die Ursprünge der Christologie als konsequente Entfaltung der biblischen Theologie." *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 44 (1979): 77–114.
—— "Wisdom, Son of Man, and the Origins of Christology: the Consistent Development of Biblical Theology." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 3 (1981): 23–57.
Gibson, Jeffrey B. "Matthew 6:9–13//Luke 11:2–4: An Eschatological Prayer?" *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31 (2001): 96–105.
Gilbert, M., ed. *La Sagesse de l'ancien Testament*. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1979.
—— "Wisdom Literature." in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2. Assen: Van Gorcum Press/ Minneapolis: Fortress, 1984.
Glasson, Thomas Francis. "Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt 24:30)." *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 (1964): 299–300.
—— "The Son of Man Imagery: Enoch xiv and Daniel vii." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1976): 82–90.
Goff, Matthew J. "Discerning Trajectories: *4QInstruction* and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Gospel Q," *JBL* 124 (2005), 657–73.
—— *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. Studies on the Texts from the Desert of Judah 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
Golitzin, Alexander. "Recovering the 'Glory of Adam': 'Divine Light' Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls Present and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia." Pages 275–308 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. Studies on the Texts from the Desert of Judah 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Goulder, Michael. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. 2 volumes. Freiburg: Herder. 1986, 1988.
Gray, William. "Wisdom Christology in the New Testament: its Scope and Relevance." *Theology* 89 (1986): 448–459.
Greenfield, J.C. "Prolegomenon" to H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*. New York: Ktav, 1973.
—— and M.E. Stone. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977): 51–65.
Grossman, Maxine. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 45. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
Gry, L., "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mysterieux en II Henoch." *Revue Biblique* 49 (1940): 195–203.
Guelich, R. "Antitheses of Matthew 5:21–48: Traditional and/or Redactional?" *New Testament Studies* 22 (1976): 444–457.
—— "Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance-requirements' or Eschatological Blessings?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976): 415–434.
—— "Mt 5:22: Its Meaning and Integrity." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 64 (1973): 39–52.
—— *The Sermon on the Mount*. Waco: Word, 1982.
Gundry, Robert. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
—— *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
—— *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Novum Testamentum Supplementary Series 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
Hagner, Donald A. "Apocalyptic Motifs in the Gospel of Matthew: Continuity and Discontinuity." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 7 (1985): 53–82.
—— *Matthew*. Word Biblical Commentaries (2 vols.). Dallas: Word, 1993, 1995.
Hahn, Ferdinand. *Frühjüdische und urchristliche Apokalyptik: Eine Einführung*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1998.
Halperin, David. *The Faces of the Chariot. Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*, Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 16. Tübingen; Mohr, 1988.
Hammerton-Kelly, Robert R.G. "Attitudes to the Law in Matthew's Gospel: a Discussion of Matthew 5:18." *Biblical Research* 17 (1972): 19–32.
—— *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
Hannah, Darrell H. "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 94 (2003): 68–96.
Hanson, P.D. "Rebellion in Heaven, Asazel and Euphemistic Heroism in 1 Enoch," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977), 195–213.
—— *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
Harrington, D.J. "Polemical Parables in Matthew 24–25." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 44 (1991): 287–298.
—— *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
—— "The *Raz Nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423)." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 549–533.
—— "The Wisdom of the Scribe According to Ben Sira." Pages 181–188 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.J. Collins. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Chico Ca.: Scholars Press, 1980.
—— "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A." Pages 263–275 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential*

Thought. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peters Press, 2002.

—— "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra." Pages 343–355 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

—— "Wisdom at Qumran." Pages 137–152 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E.Ulrich and J.C. Vanderkam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

—— *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Hartman, Lars. "An Early Example of Jewish Exegesis: 1 Enoch 10:16–11:2," *Neotestamentica* 17 (1983): 20–22.

—— *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5*, Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series 12. Lund: Gleerup, 1979.

—— "'Comfort of the Scriptures': an Early Jewish Interpretation of Noah's Salvation, 1 Enoch 10:16–11:2," *Svengsk exegetisk årsbok* 41–42 (1976–1977): 87–96.

—— *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par*. Coniectanea Biblica; New Testament 1. Lund: Almqvist & Wicksell, 1966.

—— "The Function of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables," *New Testament Studies 22* (1975–1976): 11–13.

—— and A.A. DiLella. *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible 23. New York: Doubleday, 1978.

Hasel, Gerhard F. *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*. Andrews University Monographs, Studies in Religion 5; Berrien Springs, Mich: Andrews University Press, 1974.

Healey, John F. "Models of Behavior: Matt 6:26 (Luke 12:24) and Prov 6:6–8." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 497–498.

Heil, John Paul. "The Double Meaning of the Narrative of Universal Judgment in Matthew 25.31–46." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (1998): 3–14.

Hempel, Charlotte. "The Qumran Sapiential Texts and the Rule Books." Pages 277–295 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peters Press, 2002.

Hengel, Martin. "Jesus als messianischer Lehrer der Weisheit und die Anfänge der Christologie." Pages 147–188 in *Sagesse et Religion: Colloque de Strasbourg*. Edited by Jean Leclant and Jan Bergman. Paris: Press Universitaires de France, 1979.

—— *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

—— "Zur matthäischen Bergpredigt und ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund." *Theologische Rundschau* 52 (1987): 327–400.

Higgins, Angus John Brockhurst. "Sign of the Son of Man (Matt 24:30)." *New Testament Studies* 9 (1963): 380–382.

Himmelfarb, Martha T. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hindley, J.C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: An Historical Approach," *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967–8): 551–65.

Horsley, G.H.R., "'Ti' at Matthew 7:14: 'Because', not 'How.'" *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 3 (1990): 141–143.

Horsely, Richard A. "Social Relations and Social Conflict in the Epistle of Enoch." Pages 100–115 in *For a Later Generation: the Transformation of a Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Randall A. Argall, Beverley A. Bow and Rodney Werline. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Hultgård, A. "Persian Apocalypticism." Pages 39–83 in *the Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York, London: Continuum, 2000.

Hunter, Archibald M. "Crux Criticorum—Matt 11:25–30: a Re-Appraisal." *New Testament Studies* 8 (1962): 241–249.
Idel, Moshe. "Enoch is Metatron." *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990): 220–240.
Ingelaere, Jean Claude. "La Parabole du Jugement Dernier (Matt 25:31–46)." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 50 (1970): 23–60.
Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch." Pages 5–89 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth, Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
Ito, Akio. "The Question of the Authenticity of the Ban on Swearing (Matthew 5:33–37)" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 43 (1991): 5–13.
Ivanov, Iordan. *Livres et légendes bogomiles: aux sources du Catharisme*. Les Littératures populaires de toutes les nations 22. Translated by Monette R. Ribeyrol. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1976.
Janzen, Waldemar. *Mourning Cry and Woe Oracle*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1972.
Jacobson, Arland D. "The Literary Unity of Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature 101* (1982): 265–389.
—— "Wisdom Christology in Q." Ph.D diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1978.
Jagič, V. "Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches." *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 .Vienna, 1893: 1–104.
Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Tahmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature: With an Index of Scriptural Quotations*. New York: E. Shapiro, 1926.
Jaz, M. "Hénoch et le Fils d'Homme," *La Revue réformée* 30 (1979): 105–19.
Jefferies, Daryl J. *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction*. Gorgias Dissertations, Near Eastern Studies 3. New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2002.
Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S.H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1954.
Jobes, Karen H. "Sophia Christology: the Way of Wisdom?" Pages 226–250 in *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*. Edited by James I. Packer and Sven Soderlund. Grand Rapids, Mich. :Zondervan, 2000.
Johnson, Alan. "Jesus and Moses: Rabbinic Backgrounds and Exegetical Concerns in Matthew 5." Pages 85–108 in *The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz*. Edited by Morris Inch and Ronald Youngblood. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
Johnson, Elizabeth. "Jesus, the Wisdom of God: a Biblical Basis for Non-Androcentric Christology." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 61 (1985): 261–294.
Johnson, Marshall D. "Reflections on a Wisdom approach to Matthew's Christology." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 44–64.
Jones, John N. " 'Think of the Lilies' and Prov 6:6–11." *Harvard Theological Review* 88 (1995): 175–177.
Kamlah, E. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
Kampen, John. "A Re-Examination of the Relationship Between Matthew 5:21–48 and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 29 (1990): 34–59.
—— "Aspects of Wisdom in the Gospel of Matthew in Light of the New Qumran Evidence." Pages 227–239 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
—— "The Sectarian Form of the Antitheses within the Social World of the Matthean Community," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 338–63.
Katz, Stephen T. "Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 C.E.: A Reconsideration." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 43–76.
Kea, R. "The Sermon on the Mount: Ethics and Eschatological Time," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 25 (1986): 88–98.
Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Kenyon, Frederick G. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, facs. 8: Enoch and Melito*. London: Walker, 1941.

Kilpatrick, G.D. *The Origins of the Gospel According to St Matthew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.

Kimelman, Reuben. "Birkat Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity." Pages 226–44 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Volume 2: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten and Alan Mendelson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Kingsbury, Jack D., *Matthew: Structure, Christology and Kingdom*. London: SPCK, 1976.

—— *Matthew as Story*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

—— "The 'Divine Man' as the Key to Mark's Christology—the End of an Era." *Interpretation* 35 (1981): 243–257.

—— "The Plot of Matthew's Story," *Interpretation* 46. 1992: 347–56.

Kister, Menahem. "Wisdom literature and its Relation to other Genres: From Ben Sira to *Mysteries*." Pages 13–48 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies in the Texts from the Desert of Judea 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Klijn, Albertus F. "Matthew 11:25/Luke 10:21." Pages 3–14 in *New Testament Textual Criticism; Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*. Edited by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon Pr, 1981.

Kloppenborg, John S. "Isis and Sophia in the Book of Wisdom." *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982), 57–84.

—— "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q." *Harvard Theological Review 80* (1987): 287–306.

—— *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

——, ed. *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.

Knibb, Michael A. "Interpreting the Book of Enoch: Reflections on a Recently Published Commentary," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 33 (2002): 439–42.

—— "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995), 164–84.

—— "The Book of Enoch in the Light of the Qumran Wisdom Literature." Pages 193–210 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

—— "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978–9), 345–359.

—— *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Koch, Klaus. "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?" *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 52 (1955), 1–42.

—— "Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte: Die sogenannte Zehn-Wochen-Apocalypse (1 Hen 93:1–10; 91:11–17) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 95 (1983) 403–430.

—— *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. Translated by M. Kohl. Studies in Biblical Theology 2/22. London: SCM, 1972. Translated from *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*. Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1970.

Kolenkow, A.B. "The Genre Testament and Forecasts of the Future in the Hellenistic Jewish Milieu." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 6 (1975).

Küchler, M. *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen. Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens* Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 26. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1979.

Kuntz, J.K. "The Canonical Wisdom Psalms of Ancient Israel: Their Rhetorical, Thematic and Formal Dimensions." Pages 186–222 in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by J.J. Jackson. Pittsburg Theological Monograph Series 1. Pittsburg: Pickwick, 1974.

Kupp, David D. *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 90, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Ladd, George E. "The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats in Recent Interpretation." Pages 191–199 in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merril C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub House, 1974.

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch. *Harvard Theological Review* 16 (1923): 397–398.

Lambrecht, Jan. "The Parousia Discourse: Composition and Content in Mt 24–25." Pages 309–342 in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: Redaction et Theologie*. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux, Belgium: J Duculot, 1972.

Lang, Bernard. *Frau Weisheit: Deutung einer biblischen Gestalt*. Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1974.

Lange, Armin. *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 18. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

——— "Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 340–354.

Lefebure, Leo D. "The Wisdom Tradition in Recent Christian Theology." *Journal of Religion* 76 (1996): 338–348.

Leske, Adrian M. "The Beatitudes, Salt and Light in Matthew and Luke," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 30 (1991): 817–39.

Levine, Amy J. *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History: "Go Nowhere Among the Gentiles…" (Matt. 10:56)*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14. New York: Mellen, 1988.

Lichtenberger, H. "Makarismen in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament." Pages 395–411 in W*isdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Liebschner, Siegfried. "Salt of the Earth (Matthew 5:13–16)." *European Journal of Theology* 2 (1993): 101–103.

Lipps, Hermann von. "Christus als Sophia? Weisheitliche Traditionen in der urchristlichen Christologie." Pages 75–95 in *Anfänge der Christologie: Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 65 Geburtstag*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Henning Paulsen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Lohfink, Gerhard. "Der ekklesiale Sitz im Leben der Aufforderung Jesu zum Gewaltverzicht (Matt 5:39b–42, Lk 6:29f)." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 162 (1982): 236–253.

——— "Jesus und die Ehescheidung: zur Gattung und Sprachintention von Mt 5,32." Pages 207–217 in *Biblische Randbemerkungen: Schülerfestschrift für Rudolf Schnackenburg zum 60sten Geburtstag*. Edited by Hemut Merklein and Joachim Lange. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1974.

——— "Wem gilt die Bergpredigt: eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von Matt 4:23–5:2 und 7:28f." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 163 (1983): 264–284.

Loisy, A. "Un nouveau Livre d'Hénoch." *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse* 1 (1896) 29–57.

Lövestam, E. *Jesus and "This Generation": A New Testament Study*. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 25. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1995.

Luck, Ulrich. "Das Weltverständnis in der jüdischen Apokalyptik dargestellt am äthiopischen Henoch und am 4. Esra." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 73 (1976): 283–305.

Lücke, Frederick. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johanis und in die gesamte apokalyptische Literatur*. Bonn: Weber, 1832.

Lührmann, Dieter. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 33, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

—— "Liebet eure Feinde: Lk 6:27–36; Mt 5:39–48." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 69 (1972): 412–438.

Luz, Ulrich. "Die Erfüllung des Gesetzes bei Matthäus (Mt 5:17–20)." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 75 (1978): 398–435.

—— *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989.

—— *Matthew 8–20: A Commentary*. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress.

—— *Matthew in History, Interpretation, Influence and Effects*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

—— *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by J.B. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Lybæk, Lena. *New and Old in Matthew 11–13: Normativity in the Development of Three Theological Themes*, Forschungen zur Religion un Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 198; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002.

Mack, Burton L. "The Christ and Jewish Wisdom." Pages 192–221 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

—— *The Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

—— Review of M.J. Suggs, "Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 353–355.

Marguerat, Daniel. *Le Jugement dans l'Evangile de Matthieu*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981.

Martin, Brice L. "Matthew on Christ and the Law." *Theological Studies* 44 (1983): 53–70.

Martin, François. *Le Livre d'Hénoch: Documents pour l'étude de la Bible, traduit sur le texte éthiopien*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1906.

Mastin, Brian A. "Latin Mam(m)ona and the Semitic Languages: a False Trail and a Suggestion." *Biblica* 65 (1984): 87–90.

Maunder, A.S.D. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *The Observatory* 41 (1918): 309–316.

McGaughy, Lane C. "Fear of Yahweh and the Mission of Judaism: a Postexilic Maxim and its Early Christian Expansion in the Parable of the Talents." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 235–245.

McNamara, M. *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975.

McNeile, A.H. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1915.

McNicol, A. "The Composition of the Synoptic Eschatological Discourse." Pages 157–200 in *The Interrelations of the Gospels: a Symposium Led by M.É. Boismard, W.R. Farmer, F. Neirynck, Jerusalem 1984*. Edited by David L. Dungan. Louvain: Leuven Univ Pr, 1990.

Mearns, Christopher L. "The Son of Man Trajectory and Eschatological Development." *Expository Times* 97 (1985): 8–12.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (3 vols) volume 1*: The Roots of the Problem and the Person*, New York: Doubleday 1991.Volume 2: *Mentor, Message and Miracles*, New York: Doubleday 1994.

—— *Matthew*. NT Message 3. Wilmington: Glazier, 1980.

—— "Matthew 5:3–12." *Interpretation* 44 (1990): 281–285.

—— *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1991.

Menken, Maarten J.J. "The Quotation from Isaiah 42:1–4 in Matthew 12:18–21." *Bijdragen* 59 (1998): 251–266.

Metso, S. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 21. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
Milik, J.T. "Problèmes de la Littérature hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments araméens de Qumrân," *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971): 333–378.
—— with the collaboration of Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
Milton, A Edward. "'Deliver Us from the Evil Imagination': Matt 6:13b in Light of the Jewish Doctrine of the Yêser Hârâ'" *Religious Studies and Theology* 13 (1995): 52–67.
Mitton, Charles Leslie. "Present Justification and Final Judgment: a Discussion of the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats." *Expository Times* 68 (1956): 46–50.
Modrzejewski, Joseph M. *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to the Emperor Hadrian*. Translated by Robert Cornman. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997.
Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1992.
Motte, A.R. "La Structure du Logion de Matthieu 11:28–30." *Revue Biblique* 88 (1981): 226–233.
Müller, H.P. "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik" Pages 268–293 in *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971*, Vetus Tetamentum Supplements 22. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
Münchow, Christoph. *Ethik und Eschatologie: ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1981.
Murphy, Catherine M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran Community*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 40. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
Murphy, Roland E. *Introduction to the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament*. Collegeville, Minneapolis: Liturgical Press, 1965.
—— "Religious Dimensions of Israelite Wisdom." Pages 452–453 in *Ancient Israelite Wisdom: Essays in Honour of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick Miller, Paul D. Hanson and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
—— *The Tree of life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature*. 2nd. Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
—— *Wisdom Literature: Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes and Esther*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
Newman, Carey C. ed. *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*. Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1999.
Newsom, Carol A. "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly 42* (1980): 310–329.
—— "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pages 167–187 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by W.H. Propp and Baruch Halpern. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
—— Review of Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 431–5.
Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42:1–4 in Matthew 12." *Biblica* 63 (1982): 457–473.
Nickelsburg, George W.E. "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11." *Journal of Biblical Literature 96* (1977): 343–405.
—— "Enoch, Levi and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 575–600.
—— "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to Mosaic Torah?" Pages 123–132 in *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*. Edited by Jodi Magness and Seymour Gittin. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
—— *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108 by George Nickelsburg*, Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
—— *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
—— *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

—— "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity." Pages 74–91 in *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neussner and Ernest S. Frerichs. Scholars Press Studies in the Humanities. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985.
—— "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92–105 and the Gospel According to Luke." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978–1979): 324–344.
—— "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture." Pages 333–354 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
—— "Some Related Traditions in the Apocalypse of Adam, the Books of Adam and Eve, and 1 Enoch." Pages 515–539 in *Sethian Gnosticism*. Edited by Bentley Layton. Vol. 2 of *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism. Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale New Haven, Connecticut, March 28–31, 1978*. Edited by Bentley Layton. Studies in the History of Religions: Supplements to Numen 41. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
—— "The Apocalyptic Message of 1 Enoch 92–105." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly 39* (1977): 309–328.
—— "The Bible, Rewritten and Expanded." Pages 89–156 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, Edited by Michael Edward Stone, Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2/2. Philadelphia: Fortress Press 1984.
—— "The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About." Pages 99–113 in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburstag*. Edited by Berndt Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, Harmut Stegemann and Annette Steudel. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 97. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
—— "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and some Qumranic Documents." Pages 91–119 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Edward Stone, Leiden: Brill 1999.
—— and J.C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
Noth, Martin and David Winton Thomas, eds. *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 3. Leiden: Brill, 1955.
Novakovic, Lidija. *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: a Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.170. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
Olson, Daniel C. "Recovering the Original Sequence of 1 Enoch 91–93." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 11 (1993): 69–94.
O'Neill, J.C. *Jesus the Messiah: Six Lectures on the Ministry of Jesus* (London: 1980).
Orlov, Andrei. "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 39 (2000): 130–147.
—— "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 31 (2000): 23–38.
—— "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*." *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–73.
—— "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 34 (2003): 274–303.
—— "Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch." *Henoch* 22.1 (2000): 45–62.
—— *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
—— "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000): 19–26.
—— "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998): 71–86.

Orton, David E. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplementary Series 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
Overman, J. Andrew. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism. The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
Patte, Daniel. *The Gospel According to St Matthew. A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1987.
Pennington, A. "2 Enoch." Pages 321–362 in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, Edited by H.F.D. Sparkes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
Perdue, Leo G. *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literature of Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series. Volume 30. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
—— *Wisdom and Creation*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994.
—— *Wisdom in Revolt*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991.
—— "Wisdom Sayings of Jesus." *Journal of the Foundations and Facets of Western Culture* 2 (1986): 3–35.
—— Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman, eds. *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John Gammie*. Lousville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
Philonenko, Marc. "La Cosmogonie du 'Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch'." Pages 109–116 in *Religions en Égypte: Hellénistique et Romaine: Colloque de Strasbourg, 16–18 mai, 1967*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969.
Pines, Shlomo. "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch." Pages 72–87 in *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968*. Edited by R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and Claas J. Bleeker. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970.
Poljakov, F. "Beiträge zur Edition des Merilo Pravednoe." *Die Welt der Slaven* 32 (1987): 313–33.
Porter, Stanley E. "Mt 6:13 and Lk 11:4: 'Lead Us Not Into Temptation'" *Expository Times* 101 (1990): 359–362.
Powell, Mark Allan. "Matthew's Beatitudes: Reversals and Rewards of the Kingdom." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996): 460–479.
Puech, E. "Quelques Aspects de la Restoration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39 (1988): 39–40.
—— "Un Hymne Essénien en Partie Retrouvé et les Béatitudes. 1QH V 12–VI 18 (= col XIII–XIV 7) et 4QBéat." *Revue de Qumran* 13/49–52 (1988): 59–88.
—— "4Q525 et les péricopes des Béatitudes en Ben Sira et Matthieu." *Revue Biblique* 98 (1991): 80–106.
—— and A. Steudel, "Un Nouveau Fragment du Manuscript 4QInstruction (XQ7 + 4Q417 ou 4Q418)," *Revue de Qumran* 19/76 (2000): 623–627.
Pritchard, J.B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
Przybylski, Benno. *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
Rad, Gerhard von. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. 2 vols. 4th ed., Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
—— *Wisdom in Israel*. Translated by J.D. Martin. London: SCM, 1972.
Rau, Eckhard. "Kosmologie, Eschatologie, und die Lehrautorität Henochs: Traditions- und formengeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum äthiopischen Henochbuch und zu verwandten Schriften." Dissertation, University of Hamburg, 1970.
Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "The Textual Identity, Literary History, and Social Setting of 1 Enoch: Reflections on George Nickelsburg's Commentary on 1 Enoch 1–36; 81–108," *Archiv für Religiongeschichte* 5 (2003): 283–8.
—— and Adam Becker. "Introduction: Traditional Models and New Directions." Pages 1–33 in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Edited by Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam Becker. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Reeves, J. "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library." Pages 173–203 in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by John C. Reeves. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994.

Reid, S.B. "The Structure of the Ten Week Apocalypse and the Book of Dream Visions," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 16 (1985), 189–201.

Repp, F. "Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des cod. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek." *Wiener slavistische Jahrbuch* 10 (1963): 58–68.

Riessler, P. "Henochbuch (slavisch) oder Zweiter Henoch." Pages 452–74 in *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel*. Edited by P. Riessler. Augsburg: 1928, repr. Heidelberg: F.H. Kerle Verlag, 1966.

Riches, J. *Matthew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Ringgren, H. *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostasisation of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*. Lund: Ohlssons, 1947.

Rofé, Alexander. "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran." Pages 1–12 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies in the Texts from the Desert of Judea 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.

Rowley, H.H. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic; A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*. London: Lutterworth, 1944.

Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. *Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11 und das Neue Testament*, Österreichische biblische Studien 6. Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.

Rubinstein, A. "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 15 (1962): 1–21.

Ruffle, John. "The Teaching of Amenemope and its Connection with the Book of Proverbs," *Tyndale Bulletin* 28 (1977): 29–68.

Sabourin, Leopold. "Apocalyptic Traits in Matthew's Gospel." *Religious Studies Bulletin* 3 (1983): 19–36.

Sacchi, P. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplementary Series 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996. Translated from *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua Storia*. Brescia: Paideia, 1990.

Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

—— "The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict," Pages 38–61 *Social History of the Matthean Community*. Edited by D.L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Sanders, E.P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief. 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.* London: SCM Press, 1992.

—— *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Schalit, A. *König Herodes: Der Mann und sein Werk*. Studia Judaica 4. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.

Schiffman, Lawrence. "Halakhic Elements in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran." Pages 94–99 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies in the Texts from the Desert of Judea 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

—— *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*. Hoboken: Ktav, 1985.

Schlatter, A. *Die Kirche des Matthäus*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929.

Schmid, H.H. "Creation, Righteousness and Salvation: 'Creation Theology' as the Broad Horizon of Biblical Theology." Pages 102–117 in *Creation in the Old Testament*. Edited by B.W. Anderson. London: SCM Press, 1984.

Schmid, J. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1956.

Schmidt, N. "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 41 (1921): 307–312.

Schnabel, E.J., *Law and Wisdom From Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition-Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom and Ethics*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2:16. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985.
Schneider, R. *Die moralisch-belehrenden Artikel im altrussischen Sammelband Merilo Pravednoe*. Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et Dissertationes 23. Freiburg: U.W. Weiher, 1986.
Scholem, Gershom. *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965.
—— *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. New York: Schocken Books, 1954.
—— *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead*. New York: Schocken, 1991.
—— *Origins of the Kabbalah*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
—— *Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962.
Schoors, A. "The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Texts." Pages 61–95 in *The Wisdom texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peters Press, 2002.
Schwarz, G. "Das Gebet der Gebete (Mt 6,9–13/Lk 11,2–4)." *Biblische Notizen* 70 (1993): 21–24.
—— "Er ‚wird einem klugen/törichten Mann ähnlich werden'? (Matthäus 7,24b.26b)" *Biblische Notizen* 68 (1993): 24–25.
—— "Ihnen gehört das Himmelreich (Matthäus 5:3)." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1977): 341–343.
—— "Matthaus 5:13a und 14a." *New Testament Studies* 17 (1970): 80–86.
—— "Matthaus 6:9–13/Lukas 11:2–4: Emendation und Rückübersetzung." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1969): 233–247.
—— "Matthäus 7:6a: Emendation und Rückübersetzung." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 18–25.
—— "Matthäus 7:13a: ein Alarmruf angesichts höchster Gefahr." *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970): 229–232.
—— "Zum Vokabular von Matthäus 6,19f." *Biblische Notizen* 14 (1981): 46–49.
Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. 3rd. Edition. Trans. W.C. Montgomery; London: A&C Black, 1954.
Schweizer, E. *The Good News According to Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1976.
Scopello, M. "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch." *Vigiliae Christianae* 34 (1980): 367–85.
Scott, Bernard Brandon. "The Gospel of Matthew: A Sapiential Performance of an Apocalyptic Discourse." Pages 245–262 in *In Search of Wisdom; Essays in Memory of John Gammie*. Edited by L. Perdue, B.B. Scott and D.J. Wiseman. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Pr, 1993.
Senior, Donald. "Between Two Worlds: Gentile and Jewish Christians in Matthew's Gospel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly 61* (1999): 1–23.
—— *Invitation to Matthew: A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew with Complete Tetx From the Jerusalem Bible*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977.
Sheppard, Gerald T. *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.
Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, Society for the Study of the New Testament Monograph Series 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
—— "Are the Least Included in the Kingdom of Heaven? The Meaning of Matthew 5:19." *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 54 (1998): 573–587.
—— *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
—— "The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 57 (1995): 19–48.
Simonetti, Manlio, ed. *Matthew*. 2 vols. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001.

Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund: Skrifter av kungl Humanistika Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 41, 1946).

Sokoloff, M. "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4," *Maarav* 1 (1978–1979): 197–224.

Sokolov, M.I. *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago: Teksty, Latinskii Perevod i Izsliedovanie*. Moskva: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1910.

Stanton, G.N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.

—— "Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus." Pages 273–287 *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983.

—— " 'Pray That Your Flight May Not Be in Winter or on a Sabbath' (Matthew 24:20)" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 37 (1989): 17–30.

—— *The Gospels and Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

—— "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 66 (1984): 264–84.

—— *The Interpretation of Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1983.

Stendahl, Krister, *The School of Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.

Stone, Michael, E. "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 479–492.

—— "The Parabolic Use of Natural Order in Judaism of the Second Temple Age." Pages 298–308 in *Gilgul: Essays on Transformation, Revolution and Permanence in the History of Religions. Dedicated to R.J. Zwi Werblowsky*. Edited by S. Shaked, D. Shulman, G.G. Stroumsa; Studies in the History of Religions 50. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

——, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2:2. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, London: Macmillan, 1924.

Strecker, Georg. "Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 98 (1973): 519–522.

Strugnell, John. "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran: 4QSerek Šîrôt ʿÔlat Haššabbāt," Pages 318–345 in *Congress Volume: Oxford, 1959*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 7. Leiden: Brill, 1959.

—— "The Sapiential Work 4Q415ff and Pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran: Lexical Considerations." Pages 595–608 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts and Reformulated Issues*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

——, D.J. Harrington and Torleif Elgvin, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XXXIV. Qumran Cave 4 XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Mûsār lᵉMēvîn): 4Q415ff. With a re-edition of 1Q26 by John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, S.J. And an Edition of 4Q423 by Torleif Elgvin, in Consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, S.J.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation." Pages 245–261 in *The Wisdom texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peters Press, 2002.

Suggs, M. Jack. *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ Pr, 1970.

Suter, David. W. "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50 (1979): 115–135.

—— "Māšāl in the Similitudes of Enoch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 193–212.

—— *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 47. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

Syreeni, Kari. "Separation and Identity: Aspects of the Symbolic World of Matt 6:1–18." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 522–541.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "The Addressees of 4QInstruction." Pages 62–75 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller Leiden: Brill, 2000.

—— *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 44. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill 2001.

—— "Towards a Reconstruction of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels)." Pages 99–126 in *The Wisdom texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 159. Leuven: Peters Press, 2002.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Thiesohn, Johannes. *D er auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditiongeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975.

Tiller, Patrick. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 4. Atalanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

—— "George Nickelsburg's '1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108'" Pages 365–72 in *George Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (2 volumes; volume 2; ed. Jacob Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck, JSJSupp 80; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

—— "The Eternal Planting in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 312–35.

Trudinger, Paul. "The 'Our Father' in Matthew as Apocalyptic Eschatology." *Downside Review* 107 (1989): 49–54.

Turdeanu, É. "Apocryphes Bogomiles et Apocryphes Pseudo-Bogomiles." in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religiones 138* (1950): 22–52 and 176–218.

—— *Apocryphes Slaves et Roumains de l'Ancien Testament*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Tuttle, Gary A. "Sermon on the Mount: its Wisdom Affinities and their Relation to its Structure." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (1977): 213–230.

Uhlig, Siegbert. "Das äthiopische Henochbuch." Pages 461–780 in *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch römischer Zeit, Band 5: Apokalypsen*. Edited by Werner Georg Kümmel and Hermann Lichtenberger, Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984.

Vaillant, André. *Le Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et Traduction française*. Textes publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves 4. Paris: L'Institut d'Études slaves, 1952.

—— and M. Philonenko., "Livre des secrets d'Hénoch." Pages 1187–1223 in *La Bible. Ecrits Intertestamentaires*. Edited by A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko. Paris: Gallimard, 1987.

Vanderkam, James C. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

—— *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16, Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

—— "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature." pages 32–101 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. Vanderkam and William Adler. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3/4. Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1996.

—— "Messianism and Apocalypticism," Pages 193–228 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. in Edited by J.J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 1998.

—— "Response to George Nickelsburg, '1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108'" Pages 379–86 in *George Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* . 2 volumes: volume 2. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 80. Edited by Jacob Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

—— *Revelation and Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

—— "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71." Pages 169–91 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J.C. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

—— "Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1–10; 91:11–17)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984): 511–523.

—— "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch." Pages 247–262 in *Working With No Data: Studies in Semitic and Egyptian Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Edited by D.M. Golomb. Winona Lake: Eisenbraums, 1987.

—— "The Theophany of 1 Enoch 1:3b–7,9." *Vetus Testamentum 23* (1973): 129–150.

Vasil'ev, A. *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina I*. Moscow: Sumptibus et Typis Universitatis Caesareae, 1893.

Venter, P.M. "Spatiality in Enoch's Journeys (1 Enoch 12–36)." Pages 211–230 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Verheyden, J. "The Fate of the Righteous and the Cursed at Qumran and in the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 427–449.

Verseput, Donald. *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of Matthew 11–12*. Frankfurt: Peter D. Lang, 1986.

Via, Dan O. "Ethical Responsibility and Human Wholeness in Matthew 25:31–46." *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 79–100.

Vouga, François. "The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of Matthew 11–12: a Review." *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 62 (1987): 435.

Wacholder, Ben Zion, and Martin G. Abegg. *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: the Hebrew and Aramaic Scrolls from Cave Four. Facsicle 2I*. Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1992.

Wacker, Marie-Theres. *Weltordnung und Gericht: Studien zu 1 Henoch 22*. Forschung zur Bibel 45. Würzburg: Echter, 1982.

Weber, Kathleen. "Is There a Qumran Parallel to Matthew 24,51 // Luke 12,46." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1995): 657–663.

—— "The Image of Sheep and Goats in Matthew 25:31–46." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997): 657–678.

Weiss, Johannes. "Das Logion Mt. 11, 25–30," Pages 120–129 in *Neutestamentliche Studien: Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by A. Deißmann and H. Windisch. Leipzig: Heinrich, 1914.

—— *Das Matthäus -Evangelium*, Studien zum Neuen Testament 1. 2nd. ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, 1907.

Wells, L.S.A., "The Historical Succession of the Books of Enoch: The Secrets of Enoch." *International Journal of Apocrypha* 25 (1911): 30–34.

Wengst, Klaus. "Aspects of the Last Judgment in the Gospel according to Matthew." Pages 233–245 in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian tradition*. Edited by Henning Reventlow Sheffield, Eng: Sheffield Academic Pr, 1997.

Werman, Cana. "What is the *Book of Hagu?*" Pages 125–140 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Studies in the Texts from the Desert of Judea 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Westermann, Claus. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1967.

Whybray, R.H. "The Wisdom Psalms." Pages 152–160 in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*. Edited by J. Day, R.P. Gordon and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Wilken, R.L., ed. *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Paris: University of Notre Dame, 1975.

Wilkins, Michael J. *Discipleship in the Ancient World and Matthew's Gospel*. 2nd. Ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.

Williams, James G. "Paraenesis, Excess, and Ethics: Matthew's Rhetoric in the Sermon on the Mount." *Semeia* 50 (1990): 163–187.

Wilson, Alistair I. *When Will These Things Happen: A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21–25*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004.

Witherington, Ben, III. *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

—— *Jesus the Seer: the Progress of Prophecy*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1999.

—— *The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.

Wright, N.T. *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (5 Volumes). Volume 1: *The New Testament and the People of God*. London, SPCK, 1992. Volume 2: *Jesus and the Victory of God*. London: SPCK, 1996. Volume 3: *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. London: SPCK, 2003.

Xeravits, G.G. "Wisdom Traits in the Qumranic Presentation of the Eschatological Prophet." Pages 183–192 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Yieh, John Yueh-Han. *One Teacher: Jesus' Teaching Role in Matthew's Gospel Report*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 124. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Zahn, Theodor. *Das Matthäus—Evangelium*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1922.

Zöckler, Thomas. "Light Within the Human Person: a Comparison of Matthew 6:22–23 and Gospel of Thomas 24." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001): 487–499.

Zuck, Roy B., ed. *Learning from the Sages: Selected Studies from the Book of Proverbs*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.

Zuntz, G. "Enoch on the Last Judgement." *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1944): 161–170.

—— "The Greek Text of 1 Enoch 102:1–3." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63 (1944): 53–54.

INDEX OF TEXTS
(excludes *Appendix*)

Hebrew Bible

Genesis
1:26 83, 183, 184
1:27 186
2–3 85
2:4 120
2:7 83
2:9, 15 87
2:24 106
3:18 87
5:1 120
6:9 120
9:5–6 183
37:2 120
49:10 135

Exodus
23:20 139, 141
33:12–14 149–150

Leviticus
19:19 90
26:3 91
26:20 90–91

Numbers
18:20 76

Deuteronomy
7:2 129
19:14 105
22:9 90
22:17 105
28, 30 151
30:7 129

2 Samuel
7:14 237

1 Kings
19:12 103

2 Kings
19:3 36

Job
28:25–7 130
38–41 49, 224
38:39–39:30 190

Psalms
8 49
19:1–6 49
26:5 129
33 49
50:15 36
77:3 36
104 49
110 68, 69
118:26 135
136 49
139 49
139:21–22 129, 182
147:8–9 190

Proverbs
General 10, 20

1–8 49
6:6–11 190
6:22–31 130
8:22–31 49
14:23 104
21:5 104
22:17–24:34 92, 99
25–27 92, 99

Isaiah
6:9 141
11:2–5 68, 69
13:10 168, 169
14:2 169
26:19 136
34:4 168, 169
35:5–6 136, 137
40:12–14 224
40–66 186
42:1–2 69

42:1–4 152–155, 232
42:6 69
49:4 69
59 135
60:21 85
61:1 136, 137
61:3 77
65:17–25 182
65:22 153
66:22 182

Jeremiah
2:20 150, 151
5:5 150
5:21 141
6:16 151

Ezekiel
12:2 141

Daniel
General 10
4:10, 14, 20 172
7 162, 164, 174
7:2–25 170–172
7:13 167, 170
8:13 172
10–12 172
12:1 36

Hosea
11:1 126

Obadiah
12, 14 36

Habakkuk
2:3 135, 136

Zechariah
9:9 135
14:5 135

Malachi
3:1 139, 141
3:16 81
4:5 141

New Testament

Matthew
General 115–119
1:1–4–7 119–123
1:2–16 119–123
1:22–3 123, 129
1:23, 25 155
2:1–12 125
2:5–6, 15, 17–18, 23 123
2:13–15 124
2:15, 17 129
2:16–18 124
2:23 129
3:3 123, 139
3:15 129
3:16 156
4:1 156
4:1–11 124
4:14–16 123, 129
5–7 115
5:1 126, 231
5:3–11 205–206
5:5–12 181–182
5:14–16 177
5:17–20 127, 128–30, 132
5:17–48 132
5:18 131–132
5:20 182, 186
5:21–26 177
5:21–48 127, 182–187, 206, 234
5:22 205, 206
5:23–4 117
5:37 199
5:43 130
6:1–18 206
6:19–34 187–194, 234
7:1–2 192
7:24 22, 186
7:24–26 128, 132, 180
7:28–9 126
8–9 138
8:1 126, 231
8:17 129
11–12 116, 133–135, 232
11:1–6 135–138
11:2 144

11:7–15 139–143
11:16–19 143–144
11:20–24 144, 153, 154, 158
11:25–30 133–135, 144–152, 234
11:28–30 131
11:29 154
12:6 157
12:17 129
12:17–21 152–155, 237
12:22–37 155–157
12:28 188
12:30 177, 178
12:37 154
12:38–45 155, 157–158, 171
12:41–42 153, 154
13 139
13:1–23 177, 178
13:3–52 206
13:9 141–143
13:10–17 22, 141–143, 159
13:16–7 123
13:23 22
13:35 129
13:39–41 171
13:43 141–143
13:48 129
13:54 22
14:1 145
16:16–17 236
16:27–28 60
17:24–7 117
19:3–12 183
21–25 160–161
21:1–11 161
21:4 129
22:7 116
23 132
23:2–7 177
23:4 152
23:13 177
23:13–36 206
23:15 177
23:16–22 117
23:23–29 177
23:28 116
23:34 149
24–25 116, 232–233
24:1 161, 179
24:2–4 165, 167
24:3 131–132
24:4–44 159, 163–175
24:15, 30 162
24:45–25:46 175–181, 159, 160, 206
25:1–13 22
25:31–46 60, 61, 159, 161, 175, 204
26:54, 56 129
27:9 129
28:19 154
28:19–20 158

Mark
1:27 126
13 161–162

Luke
6:17 127
7:28 140
7:35 135
11:34–36 188
19:28–44 179

Romans
8:3 182
12:19–21 217

2 Corinthians
5:1–5 192

1 Thessalonians
1:4 106

Titus
1:2 185

Hebrews
10:30 217

James
3:9 185
5:12 185

Revelation
3:4–5 192
12:4 169

Texts from Qumran

Book of Mysteries
1Q27/4Q299–301 77

Hodayot
1QH[a] 16:4–26 85–89
1QH[a] 16:6 77
1QH[a] 9:15 95

Rule of the Community
1QS 1:4, 10–11 129
1QS 3–4 188
1QS 4: 6–8 112, 193
1QS 4:22–23 112, 147, 152, 189
1QS 9:21–26 129
1QS 10:4 96
1QS 10:1, 6, 8, 11 82

4QEnoch[a–g]
4Q201 1 i 36
4Q202 5 i 52
4Q204 27
4Q204 1 i 19 96
4Q212 1 iv 20, 25 42

Damascus Document
CD 1:18–20 132

4QInstruction (4Q415–423)
General 72–73

4Q416 1 1–18 92–99
4Q416 1 10–14 74
4Q416 1 10ff 104
4Q416 2 i–ii 92
4Q416 2 ii 3ff 105–106
4Q416 2 iii 9, 17–18 79
4Q416 2 iii 18–19 90–91, 106–108
4Q416 2 iv 108
4Q416 2 iv 8–10 90
4Q417 1, 2 92
4Q417 1 i 1–23 100–103
4Q417 1 i 1 99
4Q417 1 i 8–13 108–110, 131
4Q417 1 i 13–14 99
4Q417 1 i 14–18 75, 79–84
4Q417 2 i 2–28 103–105
4Q417 2 i 5–11 78
4Q417 2 i 7 79, 84
4Q417 2 i 10–12 100
4Q417 2 i 11 110
4Q417 2 i 11–13 76
4Q417 2 iii 9 84
4Q418* 1, 2 74, 97
4Q418a 100
4Q418 2 14 97
4Q418 10 8–10 90
4Q418 43, 44, 45 100
4Q418 64 105
4Q418 69 92, 110
4Q418 69 ii 75
4Q418 81 87
4Q418 81 i 1–2, 13 76
4Q418 103 ii 7–9 90
4Q418 123 ii 2–8 79
4Q423 123 ii 5 99
4Q418 184 ii 81
4Q418 209 1 96
4Q418 221, 222 97
4Q418 229 74, 95
4Q423 1 85–89
4Q423 1, 2 110
4Q423 2 i 85–89
4Q423 3 1–5 90–91
4Q423 8 87

4QRenewed Earth
4Q475 181

4QMessianic Apocalypse
4Q521 136

11QMelchizedek 137

Pseudepigrapha, Apocrypha

Adam Octipartite 201

Apocalypse of Elijah
4:11 169

Baruch
3:9 150

2 Baruch
41:3 150

1 Enoch
General 26–30
1–37 30–39

1–5 46, 47
1:1 36
1:3–9 31, 33, 37
2:1–5:4 46, 50, 51
5:3 52, 97
5:5–9 31, 33, 36, 37, 38, 50
6–27 33
12:3–4 35
14:10–17 60
15:1 35
16:3 36
19:3 35
20:1–8 35
24:4–25:6 34
32:3–6 35
33:6 35
37–71 58–70
37:1–5 63
41–44 67, 69
42:1–3 166
42:8 67
43:1 68
43:3–4 66
45:3 60
46:2–3 67, 68
46:5 69
48 63, 64
48:4 69
48:5 69
48:6–7 66
48:10 65
49:1 64
49:3 68
51:3 66
52:4 65
53:6 65
56:5–7 59
59–60 68
61:8 60
61:9 69
62:1 65
62:2–3 60, 68
62:6, 9 69
67:7–9 59
71:5–7 60
71:14 62
81:1–2 56
82 30–31, 36
83–90 39–40
83:8 39, 42
84:4–6 39
85:3 40
86:1–3 169
88:1–3 169
89:1, 28 39
89:29–35 46
89:41 39, 47
90:2–4, 8–9 40
90:6–7 39
90:6–19 43
90:24–27 37, 40
90:28–32 42
91–106 40–45, 52–58
91:1–9 48
91:11–17 42, 43, 44
91:18–19 48
92:1 44
92:3,5 40
93:4–5 42, 47
93:4–9 44
93:6 46
93:9 47
93:10 43, 44, 47, 76–77
94:1–7 40, 41, 53, 57
94:7–9 54
94:6–95:2 41, 53
95:3–7 54, 55
95:4–7 41
95:6 41
96:1, 3, 6 41, 54, 55
96:4–8 41, 53, 54
97:1 55
97:3–10 40, 41, 53
97:7–8 54
97:10 41
98:4 55
98:8 57
98:10 40, 57
98:11, 12 54, 57
98:16 41
98:9–99:5 40, 41
98:15–99:2 46, 47, 53
99:1 54
99:2 57
99:3 54
99:10 55
99:13–15 54
99:11–16 41, 53
99:11–100:4 40
100:7–9 54
100:10 57
101:1–9 50, 52
102:4–104:8 56
103:1 56
103:2 47
103:7–8 57
105:1–9 50, 52

2 (Slavonic) Enoch
General 196–207
2:1–2 219
2:2 226
4:1 209
5:1 209
6:1 209
8 209
8:1–9:1 204–205, 211
10:1–6 204–205, 210, 216
14:1 199
15:4 199
16:4–8 199
19:6 200
20:3 199, 209
21:2 209
21:6–22:3 199
22 208, 220–225
22:6 199
22:11 200
23:1 209
24:2–30:7 210
25–26 215, 216
28:1–33:2 200
30 203
30:8–32:2 222
31:4 199
33 208
33:3–4 210
33:7 209
33:8 210, 212
33:9 212
33:10 199, 222
33:12 212
34 211, 212
35 211
36 208
39:1–4 199, 200, 202, 203
40 208
40:12–13 211, 216
40:12–42:2 217
41:1 222
42 226
42:3 211, 213, 217
42:5 222
42:6–14 205, 206, 213, 217
43 206, 218, 220
44 205
44:1 222, 224, 184
44:1–2 206
44:1–4 213
44:1–5 219
44:4 226
45:1–2 227
46:1–3 199
47:1 226
47:2–3 210
48 210, 212
48:9 226
49–51 217
49:1–2 199
50:2–51:3 226
51:5 210
52 205–206, 211, 217, 218, 226
52:5 210
53:1–4 206
54 226
56:2 224
58 206, 214, 217, 218
58:1–3 222
58:1–6 227
59 214, 227
59:1–60:4 227
61 226
61:1–63:1 206
61:4 226
62:1 226
63 214
63:1–4 227
65 206, 215, 216
65:1–11 227
65:11 226
66 206, 226, 227
66:1–5 210
68:1–4 199
69:12 214
70:6 210
70:24–5 200
71:22–37 199
71:28 199, 222
71:32–37 202
71:34 227
72:4–7 199
72:6–7 202, 203
72:7 227
73 200, 208

3 Enoch (Sefer Hekalot)
General 62, 221

3:2 224

Jubilees
General 27

4:18–20 28

Life of Adam and Eve
4:2 224

Sirach
General 20

6:18–22, 28–30 148
6:23ff 131
10:19–31 219
16:24 17:14 49
24 23, 130
39:12–35 49, 130
42:15–43:33 49
51 236
51:23–27 148
51:26ff 131

Testament of Levi
13:1–9 150

Wisdom of Solomon
7:15–8:1 49

Other Jewish and Christian Writings

PHILO
Al. Interp. 31 83

JOSEPHUS
Antiquities 8:25 138

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM
Cat. 15:22 178

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM
Homily on Mat. 76:3 178

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

Abegg, M.A. 78
Alexander, P.A. 221
Allen, W.C. 170
Allison, D.C. 127, 150, 161, 163, 168, 187
with W.D. Davies 120, 124, 126, 127, 129, 130, 135, 139, 143, 146, 149–150, 155, 157, 161, 162, 163, 166, 168, 169, 173, 176, 177, 182, 185, 188, 191, 192, 237
Andersen, F.I. 184, 196, 197, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 223, 224, 225
Anderson, G.A. 224
Argall, R.A. 28, 35, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57

Bacon, B.W. 124, 161
Barker, M. 137
Barthélemy, D. 78
Bauckham, R.J. 45, 46, 69, 185, 210
Bauer, D.R. 119–123
Beasley-Murray, G.R. 156, 162
Beaton, R. 69, 152
Becker, A. 118
Bedenbender, A. 46
Beer, G. 65
Berthelot, K. 185
Betz, H.D. 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 182, 187
Berger, K. 138
Black, M. 26, 60, 61, 63, 66
Blocher, H. 52
Boccaccini, G. 19, 41, 43, 46, 130, 162
Bockmuehl, M.A. 194–195
Böttrich, C. 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 206, 207, 208, 209, 215, 218
Bornkamm, G. 128, 131, 243
Brooke, G.J. 72, 90
Brooks, S.H. 187
Brown, R. 122
Brown, W.P. 190
Buber, M. 184
Burnett, F. 23, 165, 166, 207
Byrskog, S. 151, 255

Cadbury, H.J. 188
Caird, G.B. 163, 170, 171
Carlston, C.E. 2
Charles, R.H. 43, 59, 65, 197
Charette, B. 123, 151, 181, 189
Collins, A.Y. 60
Collins, J.J. 9–13, 29, 64, 68, 73, 83, 84, 110, 137, 171–172, 173, 229, 252
Cope, O.L. 246
Coppens, J. 66
Coughenour, R.A. 53
Crenshaw, J.L. 20
Crossan, J.D. 1, 2, 6–9, 230
Cullman, O. 139

Daube, D. 127
Davies, W.D. 120, 141
with D.C. Allison 120, 124, 126, 129, 130, 135, 139, 143, 146, 149, 150, 155, 157, 161, 162, 166, 168, 169, 173, 176, 177, 182, 185, 188, 191, 192, 237
Davila, J.R. 19, 62, 86, 137, 197, 224, 228
Dequecker, L. 35
Deutsch, C. 131, 145, 148, 238, 253, 254
DiLella, A.A. 172
Dillman, A. 97
Dimant, D. 30
Dinter, P.E. 34
Dix, G.H. 46
Dodd, C.H. 157
Doeve, J.W. 44
Duling, D.C. 138
Dunn, J.D.G. 258
Dupont, J. 188

Elgvin, T. 24, 72, 74, 76, 77, 79, 82, 85*, 86*, 87, 91, 93, 96, 101, 106, 109, 181

---

* Author/Editor of DJDXXXIV

Fischer, L. 138
Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. 112
Förster, M. 201
France, R.T. 117, 118, 124, 161, 165, 166–168, 171, 174, 175, 188
Frey, J. 75
Fujita, S. 37
Fuller, R.H. 157

Galling, K. 22
García Martínez, F. 18, 19, 41, 78, 95, 96, 106, 107, 112, 193
Garland, D. 164–165, 171, 176, 178, 180
Gerhardsson, B. 3
Gerstenberger, E. 49, 50, 53
Gilbert, M. 21, 23, 115
Glasson, T.F. 32, 170
Gnilka, J. 165
Goff, M. 12, 22, 72, 73, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 89, 91, 93, 109, 110, 189, 190
Golitzin, A. 112, 193, 221
Grabbe, L. 248
Greenfield, J.C. 46, 58, 59
Gry, L. 215
Guelich, R. 131, 182, 188
Gundry, R.H. 117, 126, 128, 129, 130, 154, 176, 177, 182

Hagner, D. 117, 118, 126, 128, 129, 131, 161, 182, 188, 190, 245
Hammerton-Kelly, R. 23, 135, 136, 142, 236, 258
Hannah, D. 58, 59, 61, 69
Hanson, P.D. 248
Harder, G. 188
Harrington, D.J. 72, 73, 78, 80*, 81, 85*, 87*, 88*, 89*, 90*, 93*, 95*, 96*, 97*, 99, 100*, 101, 102, 103*, 104*, 105*, 106*, 107*, 109*, 110, 165
Hartman, L. 31, 33, 37, 39, 44, 45, 46, 172
Hasel, G.F. 34
Healey, J.F. 190
Hempel, C. 73
Hengel, M. 22, 127
Himmelfarb, M. 18, 35
Hindley, J.C. 59
Hultgård, A. 17

Idel, M. 220

Jacobsen, A. 3
Jagić, V. 201
Janzen, W. 53
Jastrow, M. 100
Jaz, M. 68
Jefferies, D. 73, 92
Jeremias, J. 129
Johnson, M.D. 135, 136
Jones, J.N. 190

Kampen, J. 129
Kea, P. 123, 181
Kimelman, R. 117
Kingsbury, J.D. 117, 122, 133, 147, 165, 236
Kloppenborg, J.S. 1, 2–6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 135, 230
Knibb, M. 26, 28, 50, 58
Koch, K. 18, 19, 22, 44, 45, 247
Kolenkow, A.B. 28

Lange, A. 78, 79, 80, 81, 85, 99, 101, 109
Leske, A.M. 182
Loisy, A. 215
Lövestam, E. 143
Lücke, F. 17
Luz, U. 126, 128, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140, 146, 155, 159, 160, 182, 190, 191, 232
Lybæk, L. 133, 134, 140, 141, 144, 148, 151, 159, 232

MacGaughy, L.C. 178
Mack, B.L. 2
Marguerat, D. 128, 244
March, W.E. 53
Martin, F. 43
Mastin, B.A. 189
Matera, F. 133
McNeile, A.H. 162
McNamara, M. 201
Meier, J.P. 8, 166, 170

* Author/Editor of DJDXXXIV

Milik, J.T. 26, 37, 42, 50, 58, 78, 96, 197, 200, 215
Modrzejewski, J.H. 213
Morris, L. 190
Murphy, C. 104
Murphy, R.E. 52, 56

Newsom, C.A. 30, 32, 36, 113
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 63, 66, 67, 76, 77, 169, 240, 241
Norden, E. 249
Norlin, D. 2
Novakovic, L. 136, 137, 138, 144, 154, 231, 258

O'Neil, J.C. 139
Orlov, A. 199, 200, 203, 208, 222
Orton, D. 128, 149, 246

Peisker, C.H. 21
Pines, S. 214, 216
Przybylski, B. 186
Puech, E. 86

Rad, G. von 1, 17, 92
Rau, E. 31, 50, 52
Reed, A.Y. 28, 118
Riesenfeld, H. 3
Rowland, C. 17, 18, 25, 162
Rowley, H.H. 25
Ruffle, J. 92

Sacchi, P. 19, 45, 162
Saldarini, A. 118
Sanders, E.P. 8, 45
Schalit, A. 59
Schiffman, L. 90, 117
Schmid, J. 143
Scholem, G. 215
Schweitzer, A. 115
Schweitzer, E. 143
Senior, D.P. 15, 119
Sim, D.C. 156, 159, 166, 242, 243, 247, 248
Sjöberg, E. 62, 66

Stanton, G. 148, 244, 245, 252
Stone, M.E. 46, 58, 98, 222, 223
Strecker, G. 132
Streeter, B.H. 116, 242, 243
Strugnell, J. 60, 72*, 80*, 81*, 85*, 87*, 88*, 89*, 90*, 93*, 95*, 96*, 97*, 99,* 100*, 101*, 102, 103*, 104*, 105*, 106*, 107*, 109*
Stuckenbruck, L. 77, 82, 83, 88
Suggs, M.J. 148, 238, 250, 251, 257
Suter, D. 39, 49, 59, 61, 62, 67

Theissen, G. 116
Thiesohn, J. 60, 66, 68, 69
Tigchelaar, E. 72, 74, 75, 77, 78, 85, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 107
Tiller, P.A. 29, 37, 76

Vaillant, A. 196, 215
VanderKam, J.C. 17, 29, 30, 40, 41, 43, 58, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68
Vasil'ev A. 203
Verseput, D. 133, 135, 136, 139, 143, 148, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157

Wacholder, B.Z. 78
Wacker, M.T. 32
Weiss, J. 191, 249
Wenham, G. 183
Werman, C. 81
Westermann, C. 56
Whybray, R.H. 49
Wilson, A.I. 21, 61, 160, 164, 166, 168, 169, 170, 171
Witherington, B. 22, 23, 48, 115, 124, 125, 130, 131, 135, 136, 138, 147, 148, 158, 219, 236, 238, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258
Wright, N.T. 156, 163, 164, 169, 170, 171, 175, 178, 179, 233

Xeravits, G.G. 136

Yieh, J.Y.H. 133

Zahn, T. 156

* Author/Editor of DJDXXXIV